

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition

THE name of Anders NYGREN, the Swedish theologian, is well known in this country. The most outstanding of his translated works is 'Agape and Eros', but also of considerable importance is his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, with its vigorous exposition of St. Paul's message, as it is understood in the Lutheran tradition. Some of NYGREN's earlier works, however, were of a philosophical nature, but none of these has been available in an English translation. Professor P. S. Watson, who has already done much to familiarize English readers with NYGREN's thought, particularly by his translation of 'Agape and Eros', now puts us further in his debt by a translation of two of NYGREN's earlier essays under the attractive title *Essence of Christianity*. The first deals with 'The Permanent Element in Christianity', and the second with 'The Atonement as the Work of God.'<sup>1</sup>

In the translator's note we learn that the first essay 'outlines in non-technical and more or less popular form the philosophy of religion underlying its author's theological work', and that it is 'much used in Sweden as an introductory textbook for theological students'. This is not surprising, for it provides an admirable *hors d'oeuvre* to the study of the philosophy of religion. In spite of its brevity (only seventy pages), there is a certain comprehensiveness about it, and the argument is presented with simplicity, clarity, and a most pleasing orderliness. The work of the translator, also, has been done admirably.

NYGREN begins his search for the 'Permanent Element in Christianity' by denying that Christianity consists of a 'certain number of ideas or beliefs' and that the 'permanent element' can be found by eliminating those which may be regarded as transient or superficial, so that only a nucleus is left, which will be the indispensable minimum. This process has in fact been attempted by each generation, and in each case the permanent element proves to be different, for what is declared to be permanent is 'that of which the meaning and importance are understood and valued at the moment'. 'Pure subjectivity is

<sup>1</sup> Epworth Press; 12s. 6d.

the deciding factor.' So the Christian faith is presented differently by Origen, Augustine, Francis, Aquinas, Luther. Sometimes it is the historical fact of the Incarnation, the human figure of Jesus of Nazareth, which seems all-important; at others it is the eternal Christ. Hence the enduring factor in Christianity is not this or that doctrine, nor yet the highest common factor in all presentations. NYGREN finds it rather in that 'amazing vitality whereby Christianity is enabled in every new age and situation to present an aspect which supplies just what new conditions demand'. What is permanent is 'its dynamic character, its unceasing capacity for creating new historical forms'.

In order to define more precisely this 'permanent element' in relation to religion as a whole, NYGREN begins even further back than religion as such. He starts with what he calls 'The Life of the Spirit'. One of its concerns is 'the question of truth', since 'false' and 'true' are inescapable categories for serious thinkers. The possibility of establishing truth is the basic assumption behind all science. There is also the 'ethical question', the question of good and evil, right and wrong. 'Here we are dealing with the foundation, not only of all social life, but also of individual character. Think away this foundation and all real cultural life will prove to be impossible.' There is also the 'aesthetic question', which is concerned with the beautiful and the sublime, though the writer recognizes the difficulty of establishing an objective standard of reference in this sphere.

These three questions, however, do not exhaust the range of the life of the spirit. A fourth and no less fundamental question is that of the 'eternal', which we recognize as the 'religious question'. Each of the other three categories claims to be dealing with something that is 'valid'. If something is 'valid', we mean that it is valid without regard to space and time, and for all individuals without distinction. Therefore there is something eternal in it. It is its nature to be valid everywhere, always and for all. Whatever is true, whatever is good has something of



eternal validity in it. This concern with what is 'eternal' is of the essential nature of religion. It provides a truer definition of religion than one that introduces the name of 'God', because Buddhism, for instance, finds no place for God.

Having brought us by means of what is eternal to the category of religion, NYGREN next analyses the characteristic features of religion. They are four: (i) It claims to reveal the eternal. (ii) It awakens in man, in the presence of the eternal, 'a feeling of disquiet, responsibility, and judgment'. 'It sheds a deep seriousness over life.' 'It is then that the consciousness of sin and unworthiness arises.' (iii) It also seeks to effect a reconciliation between the Holy and the sinner. 'A religion which did not claim to make possible the meeting between the eternal and man . . . would be a monstrosity.' (iv) Religion also claims to be real, vital fellowship and union between the eternal and man; it seeks to infuse a divine life into man.

At this point the question is raised again: What is it that specially distinguishes Christianity from all other religions? There is no doctrine that can be quoted in answer. Our answer is only to point to 'that Person who stands at the centre of Christianity and sets his own seal on everything in it'. What other religions expect to find in God, that Christianity finds supremely in Christ. (i) Christ is the place where the eternal breaks in; He is the concrete revelation of God. (ii) This disclosure in Christ is at the same time a revelation of the unworthiness of man's whole existence. (iii) In Christ also man is offered that which can bring man and God together in reconciliation, bridging the gap between God's holiness and man's sinfulness. (iv) In Christ is found the means of man's vital fellowship with God. He is the giver of Life.

The second essay deals with the Atonement. Its whole emphasis is that the Atonement is God's gracious work for man, and those theories of the Atonement are criticized which base the Atonement on anything at all other than the free, unrestricted love of God for sinful man, as though God had to be enabled or persuaded to bring the offer of reconciliation. It is His very nature to offer it.

There are some authors whose great characteristic is that they are quite incapable of writing an uninteresting book. You may agree with them or you may disagree with them, but you cannot help being interested in what they say. Such an author

is E. Stanley JONES, and there is no doubt as to the interest of his latest book on Conversion.<sup>1</sup>

Even the non-Christian world is aware of the need of conversion. The great Indian Srinavasa Shastri said to Dr. JONES: 'I see what I need. I need conversion. Either I must find conversion for myself, or else I must warm up my heart against somebody's heart who has been converted.' That need for conversion exists as much inside the Church as outside the Church, for, as Sam Shoemaker said, 'many are not converted, but a little civilized by their religion'.

Dr. JONES's book is not a technical treatise on conversion; it is more a demonstration of conversion in action. It ranges from 'intellectuals, millionaires and diplomats to cannibals in Africa and all types in between'.

Although Dr. JONES is not writing a treatise on conversion, he nevertheless more than once analyses the stages in conversion. Beginning from Mt 18<sup>3</sup> he finds three steps. (1) 'Be converted'—a new direction; (2) 'Become as little children'—a new spirit; (3) 'Enter the Kingdom of God'—a new sphere of living. There are, he says, three movements to be discerned in all conversion—(1) Mental conflict; (2) Emotional crisis; (3) Resolution of the conflict. He quotes Sir J. Stephens: 'There is a natural history of religious conversion. It commences with melancholy, advances through contrition to faith, is then conducted to tranquillity, and after a while to rapture, and subsides at length into an abiding consolation and peace.' Dr. JONES's own appeal is that the person who is trembling on the brink should take seven steps. (1) Turn toward yourself and your past—take a good look at your life and its directions. That is review. (2) Turn from your past ways of life. That is repentance. (3) Turn yourself and your sins over to Jesus Christ. That is surrender. (4) Turn toward Him in faith and acceptance of forgiveness and a new life. That is receptivity. (5) Turn toward all your relationships and change them in the light of this new dawning light. That is restitution. (6) Turn with Him and face toward life and its future. That is life committal. (7) Turn your thoughts each night before you drop off to sleep and each morning when you awaken to this sentence, saying it to yourself, 'In Him who strengthens me I am able for anything'. That is faith rejoicing in its Redeemer and His power for anything.

<sup>1</sup> Rev. E. Stanley Jones, D.D., *Conversion* (Hodder and Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net.).



The need for conversion is amply demonstrated by the tensions of the unconverted life. Sir Philips Sidney's prayer is the universal prayer: 'O make in me these civil wars to cease'. The hell from which a man is delivered is not so much some future state of torment as something which he is creating for himself here and now. William James writes: 'The hell to be endured hereafter of which theology tells is no worse than the hell we make for ourselves in this world by habitually fashioning our characters in the wrong way'. 'Hell', says Dr. JONES, 'is portable.'

Every man needs to be delivered from his past. Henry Sloane Coffin used a vivid illustration. When men set their minds to the problem of how old newsprint could be reused to make new paper, the hardest bit of the problem was to deal with the printer's ink in the paper. 'But at length a method of de-inking has been discovered and they can again be reduced to pulp and remade into clean paper. Life imprints upon our minds a mass of stuff—some of it bitter, some of it false, some of it obscene, much of it trivial. By middle age most of us want to be de-inked and start afresh.' A Japanese pastor said to a seeker for happiness: 'Your soul wants to go to heaven, but you are weighted down by sin like lead. Jesus is the scissors that can cut that rope'. Dr. JONES quotes a story of Plotinus. Plotinus said: 'I spent the day trying to make a corpse stand on its feet without success. I came to the conclusion

that it needs something on the inside of it.' Conversion can only happen from the inside.

One significant thing in this book is the number of stories of conversions which happened as a result of Christian example, and the greatest moving force has been simple Christian kindness. At an Ashram a Hindu manufacturer said: 'Do you know why I have come? Years ago when I was a boy we heckled a missionary preaching in the bazaar—threw tomatoes at him. He wiped off the tomato juice from his face and then after the meeting took us to the sweetmeat shop and bought us sweets. I saw the love of Christ that day, and that's why I'm here.' Again and again the non-Christian has been moved, first to interest, and then to surrender, by the inexplicable Christian ability to care.

It may well be that the very essence of conversion is contained in a poem by Charles Fox which Dr. JONES quotes. Charles Fox prays to be made Foolish enough to depend on him for wisdom, Weak enough to be empowered with his strength, Base enough to have no honour, but God's honour, Despised enough to be kept in the dust at his feet, Nothing enough for God to be everything.

This is a book which vividly shows God in action, and, therefore, it is a book at once uplifting and challenging. One does not need to agree with everything in it to thrill to its stories and its vivid faith as one reads it.

## The Concept of Man as a Soul<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT LAURIN, PH.D., CALIFORNIA BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

It is becoming increasingly recognized that the Old Testament view of man is holistic. Man is not composed of a body and a soul; he is a soul. The older distinctions of dichotomy and trichotomy are now being seen as inadequate and as due, in large part, to the influence of Greek metaphysical concepts. The modern mood is summed up by Ludwig Köhler, 'soul is the nature of man, not his possession'.<sup>2</sup> Yet the New Testament concept of man has not been made clear in relationship to this. Man is a unity in the Old Testament; his body is integral to his nature. But there is a question as to this unity in New Testament teaching.

The word 'soul' or *nephesh*, as the Akkadian *napishtu* indicates, carries the original idea of 'throat' or 'neck' (Is 5<sup>14</sup>, reading more correctly

'its throat' against the A.V. 'herself'). From this quite logically developed the idea of 'breath', the life-giving substance which passes through the throat (Job 41<sup>21</sup>), that is, the 'throaty stuff'.

But at this point a very important semantic development took place. That which could be used of life-giving and life-sustaining breath, came to signify the broader concept of individual men and animals in their totality as living beings (Gn 1<sup>20</sup>, Ex 1<sup>5</sup>). To speak of *nephesh* in the Old Testament very often is to speak of 'man', or indeed even of 'animal' (Pr 12<sup>10</sup>).<sup>3</sup> Man is not

<sup>1</sup> We hope to have a reply to this article.—Editor.

<sup>2</sup> L. Köhler, *Old Testament Theology*, 142.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. N. Snaith, 'Heart and Soul and Spirit', in *The Preacher's Quarterly*, iii. [1957] 21: 'Preachers need to realize that if they use Genesis 2<sup>7</sup> to refer to man's immortal soul, they must also assume, on the basis of Genesis 2<sup>19</sup> and of other passages also, that an animal also has an immortal soul'.



seen as an incarnate soul; he is a soul. Man does not have a body and a soul, or a body, a soul, and a spirit. This is made clear in the Creation story when God takes the 'body' which He formed from the dust of the ground, and breathes into it the breath of life, that is, His 'spirit' (cf. Job 27<sup>3</sup> 33<sup>4</sup>). The result of this combination is the creation of a 'living *nephesh*', that is, man (Gn 2<sup>7</sup>). As long as the spirit energizes the body, so long is there man. The spirit is the animating power, the cause of the existence of man. If God should take back His spirit, then 'man' ceases to exist (Job 34<sup>14, 15</sup>; cf. Gn 6<sup>17</sup> 7<sup>15, 22</sup>, Jos 11<sup>11</sup>). Ecclesiastes speaks of death as the spirit returning to God who gave it, and the body returning to dust (Ec 12<sup>7</sup>). This does not mean simply that 'man' dies and goes into another state of being. It signifies that there is no longer any 'man'. Yet this does not mean extinction, as we shall see in a moment.

So man is flesh in the form of a body. But flesh is only the corporeal stuff of man. Man is not only flesh. Man is flesh inbreathed by the spirit; when there is no spirit or no flesh there is no man.

At times *nephesh* seems to be used as if it were a part of man, not man in his totality. For example, it is used to describe something physical that hungers and thirsts (Ps 107<sup>5</sup>), and also something emotional that can be distressed (Gn 42<sup>21</sup>), and thus often comes to be used for the ego itself (Job 16<sup>4</sup>, Ps 124<sup>7</sup>).<sup>1</sup> But these particular or localized usages are to be explained as expressions of the life principle in specific functions of the organism. *Nephesh* means life, but this can be manifested in various ways. This is simply the principle of synecdoche.<sup>2</sup> The *nephesh* is the individual in his totality. When Dt 12<sup>23</sup> and Lv 17<sup>14</sup> say that the 'blood is the soul', they do not mean that the soul can thus be localized. Since blood is the sustainer of life physically, and since the soul exists only when there is life in the body, the identification of blood and soul is therefore clear. Man is a soul, but remains such only so long as there is blood.

After death the *nephesh* ceases to exist, lingering only so long as the body is a body (Job 14<sup>22</sup>, Ec 12<sup>7</sup>). Death causes the *nephesh* to depart; when life is restored it returns. So we read of Rachel that 'it was when her *nephesh* departed, for she died, that she called his name Ben-oni, but his father called him Benjamin' (Gn 35<sup>18</sup>; cf. Jer 15<sup>9</sup>, Job 11<sup>20</sup>). Thus any weakening of the bodily functions, such as

<sup>1</sup> Semantic polarization can be observed when *nephesh* is used at one extreme to denote the principle of life in man or animal (Gn 37<sup>21</sup>), and at the other to speak of a dead body (Nu 19<sup>11</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*, 41, 83.

through hunger or thirst, is described as the draining away of the power of the *nephesh* (La 2<sup>12</sup>), and conversely when a man is strengthened the vitality of the *nephesh* is restored (La 1<sup>11</sup>).

So the word 'soul' does not refer to a particular thing, to something that can be accurately described in detail. The soul is not a spiritual entity that enters the body at birth and leaves it at death. It is simply man in his totality. It is not something which exists before the body, which is clothed with the body. 'Soul is simply the individualized spirit, delimited by its connexion with a body.'<sup>3</sup> Therefore the sharp dichotomy of the Greek concept does not fit Hebraic thought. The *nephesh* cannot be separated from the body, any more than it can from the spirit.

This can also be seen in the fact that the word *nephesh* is never used of a disembodied spirit or being after death; the inhabitants of Sheol are never called 'souls'. They are *rephaim*, 'shades, ghosts', partial replicas of this life, 'sunken beings' (as the root meaning suggests). But this shadowy existence, in which there is a certain resemblance to the earthly form (Ezk 32<sup>30</sup>, Is 14<sup>9-11</sup>, 1 S 28<sup>14</sup>) and where there is a measure of consciousness without pain or bliss (Is 14<sup>9-11</sup>, Job 31<sup>7-19</sup>), is indicative of the unitary concept of man. Any sort of life, even in Sheol, must manifest itself in a bodily form or shape.

Thus man at death is not annihilated; he becomes a *rapha* and no longer a *nephesh*. Yet this condition cannot really be called life; it is semi-life or a state where 'nothing means anything any more'.<sup>4</sup> Genuine life requires a body on this earth energized by the spirit.

Although the New Testament on occasion particularizes *psychē* to refer to the 'breath' (Ac 20<sup>10</sup>, Rev 8<sup>9</sup>) or to the seat of thoughts and feelings (Lk 14<sup>6</sup>, Mt 22<sup>37</sup>), it continues the same unitary concept of man (cf. Ac 2<sup>43</sup>). Man is nowhere conceived of as eternally existing in a bodiless state. The New Testament does not teach immortality of the disembodied 'soul' of Platonic thought. The ultimate destiny of man is in a body in an earthly locale (cf. Rev 21<sup>2</sup>, 2 P 3<sup>13</sup>, 1 Co 15<sup>44</sup>). Paul speaks in 2 Co 5<sup>1-10</sup> of being 'naked' after death until he puts on the resurrection body. True man is still a 'soul' or *psychē*, a body-spirit unity.

Yet the New Testament also seems to see the soul as something that continues to exist after death in a conscious state. John speaks of the 'souls' of those who had been slain for their

<sup>3</sup> L. Köhler, *op. cit.*, 145.

<sup>4</sup> S. B. Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic*, 28; for further details about Sheol, cf. R. Laurin, 'Sheol', in *Baker's Dictionary of Theology* (ed. E. F. Harrison), 484-485.



witness (Rev 6<sup>9</sup>). Jesus said, 'do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul; rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell' (Mt 10<sup>28</sup>; cf. 6<sup>25</sup>, Mk 8<sup>36</sup>).

What is the solution to this? Is there a disparity of concept between the Old and New Testaments? Does the New Testament see the *psychē* as a separate entity distinct from the body? There is no disparity, only an expansion of teaching. One of the great effects of the Resurrection in New Testament thought is that the Christian is a different kind of 'man'. He is a 'spiritual' (*pneumatikos*) man<sup>1</sup> while the non-Christian is a 'soulish' (*psychikos*) man<sup>2</sup> or 'fleshly' (*sarkikos*) man<sup>3</sup> (1 Co 2<sup>14</sup> 15<sup>45</sup>). This does not imply that Christians are not 'souls' (cf. Mt 10<sup>28</sup>, Rev 6<sup>9</sup> 20<sup>4</sup>, Ja 1<sup>21</sup> 5<sup>20</sup>). It is only another way of saying that since the Christian is to have a spiritual body (1 Co 15<sup>44</sup>), he has now become a 'spiritual soul', while the non-Christian remains a 'fleshly soul'. As O. Cullmann says:

'... in spite of the fact that the Holy Spirit is already so powerfully at work, men still die; even after Easter and Pentecost men continue to die as before. Our body remains mortal and subject to sickness. Its transformation into the spiritual body does not take place until the whole creation is formed anew by God. Then only, for the first time, there will be nothing but Spirit, nothing but the power of life, for then death will be destroyed with finality. Then there will be a new substance for all things visible. Instead of the fleshly matter there appears the spiritual. That is, instead of corruptible matter there appears the incorruptible... this is certainly not the Greek sense of bodiless Idea! A new heaven and a new earth. That is the Christian hope. And then will our bodies also rise from the dead. Yet not as fleshly bodies, but as spiritual bodies... flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom. Paul believes in the resurrection of the *body*, not of the *flesh*. The flesh is the power of death, which must be destroyed'.<sup>1</sup>

This difference between the Christian and the non-Christian can be seen in the fact that the New Testament speaks of the Christian as a re-creation (2 Co 5<sup>17</sup>) and as born of the Spirit (Jn 3<sup>6</sup>), while the non-Christian is of the old creation, born of the flesh (Jn 3<sup>6</sup>; cf. Ro 8<sup>1-8</sup>). 'Flesh' signifies the natural man as a whole in his weakness, while 'spirit' speaks of God in His power (Is 31<sup>3</sup>, Ro 6<sup>19</sup>, Jn 3<sup>6</sup>). The Christian has the presence of the Spirit in a way the non-Christian does not. The Christian has been recreated by the new work of the Spirit, who has come this time, in distinction

from the old dispensation,<sup>2</sup> to indwell the believer and give him 'eternal life' (2 Co 1<sup>22</sup> 5<sup>1-10</sup>, 1 Co 15<sup>45</sup>, Ro 8<sup>11</sup>, Eph 3<sup>17</sup>). Those born with Adam are souls, quickened by the Spirit, but doomed to the shady existence of Hades or Sheol. Those born with Christ are souls, indwelt by the Spirit, destined for eternal life.

But *psychē* is always used in the New Testament of an earthly being, whether he is a new creation by God or not. The 'soul' does not exist after death even in New Testament thought. John in Rev 6<sup>9</sup> does not imply that the *psychē* is alive after death. He is using a convenient designation or a symbolic description of Christian dead. He is using familiar analogies to describe unfamiliar beings. 'Soul' implies a body, he saw the appearance of a body, and so speaks of a 'soul'. The actual condition of the being is difficult to say. This is apocalyptic imagery, so the form of the 'soul' is in any case symbolic, just as that of the beast or the woman in scarlet, and is not to be pressed as to its exact definition.

The interpretation of Mt 10<sup>28</sup> also bears this out. The Christian, says Jesus, does not fear death, for his *psychē* will exist in the Messianic age. In other words, the Christian will be alive in a body during this period. The non-Christian does fear death, for his *psychē*, that is, the 'man' himself, will be destroyed when his body is destroyed. We should be careful not to make a dichotomy between 'body' and 'soul' of exclusive elements (cf. 1 Th 5<sup>23</sup>, 1 Co 7<sup>34</sup>), as do many. Man is a unity, but his physical and spiritual life may express different manifestation of the same self. In this case *psychē* represents the life or immaterial part, just as on occasion it does in the Old Testament. In Dt 6<sup>5</sup> a somewhat similar enumeration emphasizes the totality of the personality. So Matthew says, 'do not fear those who destroy this body, but cannot touch your real life, but fear those who will deny you eternal life by hiding the means to the indwelling Spirit' (cf. Mt 16<sup>25, 26</sup>).

Thus in both Testaments the 'soul' is an inhabitant of this earth only, a body-spirit unity. But it is important to realize that neither the Old nor the New Testament declares that man is by nature immortal. What it does say, as Snaith points out,<sup>3</sup> is that 'if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation' (2 Co 5<sup>17</sup>). The Christian has eternal life; the non-Christian does not. The New Testament expands the Old Testament teaching to show that the believer is one who has the Spirit indwelling, thus giving him this eternal life.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the promise of the 'new spirit' in Ezk 37<sup>14</sup> 39<sup>29</sup>, also Th. Vriezen, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*, 170, note 1; Ph.-H. Menoud, 'Holy Spirit', in *A Companion to the Bible* (J.-J. Von Allmen, ed.), 169.

<sup>3</sup> N. Snaith, *op. cit.*, 23.

<sup>1</sup> O. Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?*, 45-46.



What, then, is it that exists after death? In the Old Testament it is a *rapha*, a 'ghost, shade', a being from whom life's power is gone and who only half-exists, conscious but unable to satisfy itself. In the New Testament it appears that the word 'spirit' (*pneuma*) has developed to indicate this incorporeal being (cf. 1 P 3<sup>18, 19</sup>, Lk 24<sup>39</sup>, Heb 12<sup>23</sup>—those not yet clothed with the resurrection body). This is consistent with the fact that the 'spirit' is that element which is most closely connected with God, and thus any form of life must be due to His power. The characteristics of this 'spirit', however, are not defined. The Bible is notoriously unconcerned with the details of the intermediate state.

Paul said that he wished 'to depart, and to be with Christ' (Ph 1<sup>23</sup>), and that 'while we are at home in the body we are away from the Lord' (2 Co 5<sup>6-8</sup>). The exact location and condition of this abode of the righteous dead is unknown. The essential thing is that the righteous dead are not abandoned by Christ,<sup>1</sup> even though they have not yet attained to the fulness of felicity (Rev 6<sup>9a</sup>). They yet lack the resurrection body. But this is not a state to be feared, because death for the Christian does not mean the shadowy existence of Sheol, but the presence of the Lord (Ro 8<sup>38</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> 'Therefore something is indeed changed for the dead, for those who really die in Christ, *i.e.* in possession of the Holy Spirit. The horrible abandonment in death, the separation from God, of which we have spoken, no longer exists, precisely because the Holy Spirit does exist. Therefore the New Testament emphasizes that the dead are indeed *with Christ*, and so not abandoned' (O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, 53).

A distinction, of course, must be made between Hades (hell) and Gehenna. To the former goes everyone after death to await the resurrection. This is the New Testament counterpart for Sheol. But Gehenna is the place to which the wicked are delivered after the last judgment to undergo their punishment; it is the second death (Rev 20<sup>6, 14</sup>). But the exact condition of the after-life is uncertain. There is definitely no annihilation, for even the Old Testament pictures some form of existence. What becomes of the natural man is not clearly explained, for, as I mentioned, the Bible is not especially interested in metaphysical distinctions. All that is really stated is that he is punished in Gehenna. It could well be a place where there is the continual dissolution of personality, the realization of the inability to accomplish satisfaction, either physically or spiritually. A hint of this is perhaps given in the pathetic words of the *rephaim* in Sheol (Is 14<sup>9-10</sup>, Ec 9<sup>10</sup>). With the recreated Christian the spirit remains, and thus the real personality is retained. The exact form is not certain.

So when we preach to save 'souls' we preach to save the real man, the whole man, by making it possible for the Spirit to indwell the believer, giving him eternal life. Salvation is thus a work on the whole personality and is to have its effects on the whole man. It is now as well as future. The Bible promises a life beyond the grave to those who have experienced salvation from sin and the new creation in Christ. But it is not salvation from a future physical death; it is salvation into eternal life now, a different quality of life, a life that physical death cannot destroy, a life that needs nurture now as well as in the future.

## Literature

### A GOSPEL WITHOUT MYTH

For those who want a refutation of Bultmann to put into the hands of divinity students, *A Gospel without Myth*, by Professor David Cairns (S.C.M.; 25s. net), will be of considerable value. One is grateful to Dr. Cairns for bringing forward and criticising Bultmann's hitherto untranslated but very important essay on Miracle and for a careful study of Bultmann's sermons.

Besides dealing with Heidegger and Bultmann, Professor Cairns takes up the work of my own colleague, Dr. Macquarrie. As Dr. Macquarrie is reviewing this book for another periodical, perhaps I might concentrate on Professor Cairns's treatment of the two German thinkers. His main criticism of Heidegger is a development of a point

made by Schumann in the original edition of 'Kerygma und Mythos' to the effect that an ontological account of man's being cannot be given without taking into account his relation to God. There is something to be said for this viewpoint. But acceptance of it entails the admission that the being of man is a subject on which Christian and non-Christian will never agree. Bultmann, on the other hand, moved, it may be, by his desire to evangelize the intellectual, is willing to start from a position which he takes to be common to both Christian and non-Christian, the position, namely, that both faith and unbelief are possibilities for human life.

There are other and interesting points in the treatment of Heidegger though one wonders if Mrs. Grundy, Dr. Cairns's rendering of 'das



Man', is not too localized and dated a figure adequately to represent a phenomenon which is still operative in the life of a contemporary Teddy boy. When he turns to Bultmann, Professor Cairns is concerned to show that the latter has misconceived the relation between Heidegger's philosophy and his own theology. *Prima facie*, this is not the easiest case to establish. Bultmann and Heidegger were not only colleagues but close friends. Yet Professor Cairns's case is well worth studying, though sometimes in difficult issues one wonders if it does do justice to the other side. Can one just say 'it would be nonsense to say that the Heideggerean resolve to be oneself in the face of death is the ontological structure, and the Bultmannian "relation to the invisible" is its ontical filling?' I may be wrong and Dr. Cairns may be right, but it seems to me that Heidegger does include something very like the invisible and the undisponible in his conception of death and that Bultmann comes in with the Christian and ontic position that through grace we are able to meet these factors as love.

In fairness I must add that many of Cairns's criticisms of Bultmann on such subjects as miracle and the objectively historical seem valid and to the point. On such things as logical analysis and the difference between the present and the pre-war theological situations his views are illuminating. But the polemical side of the present book is fairly marked. Thus on p. 77 he writes: 'I wish to have the right on occasion to snap my fingers at Heidegger's existential analysis, and to secure others in that right also. And . . . if Heidegger's claims are substantiated, then every B.D. student specializing in theology will have to spend some weeks or months in mastering *Sein und Zeit*.' Now if one leaves Bultmann for Heim (a theologian whom Dr. Cairns rightly admires), there comes a time in one's exposition of the latter when one simply has to explain Heidegger's concept of *Geworfenheit*. One does so by pointing out that there are factors in life like one's parents or one's IQ which simply have to be accepted. This is a very important element in life which many people feel acutely and which Heidegger has put his finger on and other philosophers ignored. To explain it does not take weeks or months. Five minutes is nearer the time. The procedure is simply that guarded application of Heidegger's individual insights which Dr. Cairns commends but which his own picture of Heidegger hardly does much to encourage.

So with Bultmann. Dr. Cairns has some nice things to say of him but his last word is to speak of 'tensions . . . which sink so disastrously the vessel of Bultmann's theology'. Has Bultmann's

thought ended in shipwreck? If it has, would it be influencing theology so much?

IAN HENDERSON

### J. G. HAMANN

In this scholarly study—J. G. Hamann 1730–1788: *A Study in Christian Existence* (Collins; 21s. net)—the first in this country, Professor Ronald Gregor Smith introduces us to Hamann, the Magus or Wizard of the North, the gadfly or goad of the *Aufklärung*, an 'eighteenth century Socrates, sent to stab men wide awake'. Hamann had too much 'originalite' for the *Aufklärung*, and some of 'the Enlightened' in the nineteenth century as well as the eighteenth thought that he was mad! Hamann, of course, was absolutely certain that the *Aufklärung* itself was mad—the Age and the Autonomy of Reason! Was Reason all? Was it the whole man, and 'the measure of all things'? So Hamann launched his attack upon the Rationalism of his day, and kept it up until the day of his death. Not that he was the enemy of Reason. But he would 'keep it in its place' and would not subordinate 'the noble *sum* to the *cogito*'. Reason was not given to us to make us wise, but to show us our folly and ignorance, and to convince us how unreasonable our Reason was!

Now Hamann is the kind of thinker who lures you on until you are carried off your feet. All we must do here, however, is to invite readers in this country to become acquainted with Hamann by reading this Introductory study. The book is in two parts. The first, in six chapters, is biographical and expository, with the proper emphasis on that strange 'conversion' when he was in London where, after much 'riotous living', he suddenly descended into the hell of self-knowledge and like the prodigal in the great Parable 'came to himself', arriving at last at the 'haven' where all would be. His own vivid account of this experience in London may be read in the second part of this book, which contains Gregor Smith's translations of selected writings of Hamann. This conversion was not merely pietist, any more than were those world-shaking 'conversions' of St. Paul, St. Augustine, Pascal, Luther, Calvin, and John Wesley, all of whom were giants of the Faith, fighting the battles of the Lord! Their stories still have power in this 'nuclear age' to warm the cold, bleak heart of man. In his own way, as Gregor Smith's sympathetic essay has revealed, Hamann, too, fought the battles of the Lord in an age when apparently Reason and a religion of *Humanität* were all. And men like Kant and Herder, and Goethe in his golden years,



and, in the next generation, Søren Kierkegaard and Hegel, felt his originality and power.

A complete edition of Hamann's letters is now in progress in Germany. Gregor Smith has provided us with a few examples in English and whetted our appetite for more. Perhaps one day he will translate them all for us, that we may hear Hamann 'answering for himself' in his own ironical, humorous, often puzzling, but always seminal and original 'chit-chat'.

JAMES MACKINTOSH

### FREEDOM AND IMMORTALITY

In *Freedom and Immortality* (S.C.M.; 16s. net) are published the Forwood Lectures which Professor Ian T. Ramsey delivered in the University of Liverpool in 1957. When he chose Freedom and Immortality as his theme he was doing more than adding another chapter to the library of ancient and threadbare controversies. He set out to defend, in principle, the validity of metaphysics and of philosophical theology. For he is in sympathy with the contemporary English empiricism, and he accepts the insights of the new linguistic analysis. These philosophical movements, temporarily triumphant, are widely held to imply the rejection, as meaningless, of all discussion which moves beyond the limits of empirical experience. The problems of moral freedom and personal immortality are typically metaphysical: and even if metaphysics were allowed, they would be among the most ancient and the most recalcitrant of its conceptions. If they can be shown, within the basic outlook of logical empiricism, to be defensible, something of critical importance will have been achieved.

The *modus operandi* of Professor Ramsey's defence is this. He determines the question at issue in the free-will controversy afresh. It is the question whether an impersonal object-language, talking in terms of observables and their spatio-temporal connexions, is capable of telling the full story of human activities. Granted that the perceptual, the spatio-temporal and causal, the various scientific descriptions are valid, and are always a large part of the story, 'the believer in free-will holds that in a certain kind of decisive action a man realizes himself as something more than... all these stories—be they of biochemistry, economics, psychology and so on—talk about'. We are provided with empirical instances of such 'disclosure situations' which can bring this to light, and are led to realize that it is in face of moral decisions that this 'something more' is most convincingly revealed. For in a man's response to a moral situation the 'something more' is disclosed as not merely subjective—

though it is this—but as objective also. 'A transcendent decision is a response to a transcendent object', and to talk of such a response in terms of cause and effect is to be guilty of a logical howler.

This is the crux of the argument. Once the 'something more' is disclosed to us in moral decision, we recognize the reference and so the meaning of the concept of freedom and we hold the key to the proper use of 'freedom'-language. Further, the way is open to a wider extension of the argument. Moral decision is not the only instance in which the 'something more' is disclosed, even if it be the most incontrovertible. It recurs over the whole field of characteristically *personal* activity, where it alone explains the peculiar logical behaviour of the first personal pronoun. If 'I' am something more than can be fully described in spatio-temporal terms, the origin and reference of the concept of immortality is revealed. The mortality of an organism which is born and dies is wholly describable in a language of temporal succession. The 'something more' transcends it. Similarly, the Self that is experienced, subjectively, as 'something more' than any 'object' story would make it, demands its objective counterpart in God. To quote Professor Ramsey, 'Belief in God and in immortality fit together, and find their anchorage in the same kind of situation'.

In spite of this weighty theme, the manner of the book is simple and clear. The writing is quite free of jargon, kept down to earth by homely illustration and adorned by wit. It should be carefully read and then read carefully again.

JOHN MACMURRAY

### EDUCATIONAL AIDS

From the National Sunday School Union come the *Graded Teacher Lesson Handbooks* for 1960-61, edited by Christine Cannell (7s. 6d. net each). These lesson helps are in four volumes—for Beginners, Primary, Junior and Senior Classes. The lessons follow the course designed by the British Lessons Council, and, as always, all the contributors are competent educationists and writers with practical experience of Sunday School teaching. Each lesson contains Bible references, background notes for the teacher, an outline of the lesson, and suggestions for further activity in handwork or worship. There are excellent practical illustrations, especially in the volume for Beginners. These annual lesson notes are warmly commended.

Similar in scope are the four volumes of *Methodist Notes*, edited by Ernest H. Hayes (Methodist Youth Department; 7s. 6d. net each). The Church at large owes a great debt to Mr. Hayes



and his collaborators for bountiful provision of imaginative, Biblical material for teaching children.

From the same Department come two plays suitable for presentation by members of a youth fellowship. *One Thing I Know*, by Madeline Myers (1s. 6d. net), is a religious play in five scenes centred on the healing of the man born blind (Jn 9). *You've Got To Be Tough*, by Leonard Barnett (1s. 6d. net), is a one-act play for four people, dealing with the encounter of a 'respectable' newly married couple with the leader of the local delinquent gang.

Any publication by the Religious Education Press deserves attention, and their latest 'Do-It-Yourself' series of Diorama teaching aids is excellent. No. 1 is *Christmas Crib*, by H. W. Whanslaw (1s. 6d. net). The model can be coloured, cut out, and arranged in dramatic form as hand-work. No. 2 is *The Home at Nazareth*, by the same author, and illustrates the Eastern background of Bible stories (1s. 6d. net).

DONALD M. MCFARLAN

### THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND

It is a commonplace that it takes an expert to write a short book on any subject. Once again that is demonstrated in *Scotland: Church and Nation Through Sixteen Centuries*, by Gordon Donaldson, D.Litt. (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net). This is the story of Christian Scotland, or the history of the Church in Scotland from the point of view of its place in the nation. Englishmen always find it difficult to understand these things: here they may learn without tears. Scotsmen, though better instructed, often mix their history with a mythology carried over from their denominational past. Dr. Donaldson is himself an episcopalian and in his final chapter on Presbyterian-Episcopal relations he ventures on ground where it is impossible to avoid treading on some one's toes. Even in earlier chapters there are judgments passed which will cause some readers to question. Yet, a few sharp phrases apart, most of these judgments are easier to question than to refute, for Dr. Donaldson knows the sources, and the lucidity and conciseness of his narrative are admirable. There are misprints on pages 10 and 16, and a word is omitted on page 26 line 7.

STEWART MECHIE

### GEORGE WHITEFIELD

It may surprise many to learn that there has never been a complete edition of *George Whitefield's Journals*. The task of making good this lack has now been successfully completed by the Banner of Truth Trust in a sumptuary illustrated

volume of five hundred and ninety-four pages at the remarkably low price of 15s. net. Mr. Iain Murray, who appears to have had the main responsibility for editing, has assembled the seven Journals, covering 1737-41, together with an unpublished Journal of 1744-45, prefaced by the Short Account and Further Account of God's dealings with Whitefield from infancy (1714) to the embarkation for Georgia (1737). The text is that of Wale's 1905 edition of the fuller text, corrected and annotated. The whole is prefaced by a useful chronology of 1714-45.

The editors consider that in days when the Church is failing to attract the masses to hear the gospel, 'there could be nothing more timely than the prayerful study of the life of George Whitefield'. With the spirit of this motive few will disagree. They may be less happy about the second motive. An appendix gives Whitefield's letter to John Wesley in answer to the latter's sermon on Free Grace. It is argued that the doctrine of the answer, read along with the evangelism of the Journals, demonstrates that Whitefield rather than Wesley was responsible, under God, for the revival in England and that it was a Calvinist rather than an Arminian Creed which originated the awakening of the eighteenth century. It is not easy to see how the raking of the ashes of the old unhappy controversy can help to kindle the fires of evangelism to-day.

MARCUS WARD

### PALESTINIAN ARCHAEOLOGY

Interest in the archaeology of Palestine has never been greater than it is to-day, and there is a wealth of general books on the whole subject from which the reader may choose. The latest is from the pen of Dr. Kathleen Kenyon—*Archaeology in the Holy Land* (Ernest Benn; 36s. net)—whose acquaintance with the whole field is unsurpassed and whose excavation of Jericho has produced such remarkable results. Readers whose only interest is in the light shed by archaeology on the Old Testament should be warned that more than half this volume is devoted to the pre-Israelite period. This is not surprising, since if Carbon-14 dating is to be relied on—Dr. Kenyon urges that it should be used with caution—settlement in the Jericho area can be traced back to almost 8000 B.C. For her story the authoress utilizes the results of excavations at all the Palestinian sites that have been dug, and skilfully correlates the evidence from one site with that from another—with an eye on the relevant evidence from extra-Palestinian sites—to trace the story of the development of culture in the land as the spade of the excavator has brought it to light. As is well



known, singularly little written evidence has been unearthed, but the patience and skill of scholars acquainted with modern techniques has made the interpretation of such evidence as there is an illuminating task. Direct evidence to link the story with Biblical incidents is usually lacking, but often what the spade uncovers can be read in the light of the Biblical record with high probability to bring in its turn illumination to the pages of the Old Testament. This is not quite the movement in a circle it may seem, but caution is always necessary, and Dr. Kenyon displays it throughout. On the vexed questions associated with the story of the Exodus this caution is particularly shown—and rightly, since they cannot be fully discussed without the examination of evidence from outside Palestine, and especially from Egypt, which can have no place in this book. On p. 159 there is a reference to 'the last centuries of the second millennium' where the context shows that what is meant is 'the last centuries of the third millennium'. This is a rare slip in a work which is marked by accuracy of knowledge and balance of judgment. The book is admirably illustrated, and at the end there is a list of Palestinian sites which have been excavated, with short notes on each.

Another work, dealing with three particular sites, is the *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, xxxiv-xxxv. (New Haven, Conn.; \$9.00). Here Lawrence A. Sinclair presents the results of the excavations carried out by the Jerusalem School in 1933 at Tell-El-Fûl, which is identified with Gibeah, while R. L. Cleveland writes on the work carried out by the School in 1934 on what has been designated the Conway High Place at Petra and on the sounding at Khirbet Ader, north-east of Kerak, in 1933. In each case the author gives an account of the building constructions that were laid bare and of the pottery which was brought to light. For the student of the Old Testament the account of the work at Gibeah will have most interest. This, it will be remembered, was Saul's capital. Its story is divided into periods, the last continuing into the Hellenistic Age, and the account of what is identified as Saul's fortress belongs to the second period. The operations of the Jerusalem School were not the first to be carried out at Gibeah, for it was one of the earliest Palestinian sites to be excavated. Petra is of less direct interest for the study of the Bible, but it will always have a fascination for the traveller. The Conway High Place consists 'basically of a sacred rock-mass and an ambulatory around it which was used for ritual purposes'. The author brings this into relation with other ancient Semitic sanctuaries, and in particular with the sacred rock of the Temple area of Jerusalem. The work at Khirbet Ader occupied

only a few days, but it yielded fruitful results, though little for the Biblical student. This volume is again well illustrated with plates and drawings of pottery and other objects found. It is written more for the technical scholar than Dr. Kenyon's book, but without many such volumes as this her work could not have been written.

H. H. ROWLEY

### A VALUABLE INDEX

The famous publishers E. J. Brill of Leiden are to publish (in English) a series of books under the general title of 'New Testament Tools and Studies'. The editor of the series as a whole is to be Dr. Bruce M. Metzger, Professor of New Testament Language and Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary.

The first volume to be published in this series is entitled *Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul* (14 guilders), and the compiler of it is Dr. Metzger himself, though he has had many assistants in the detailed and exhausting work involved in the production of such a volume as this. The work started in 1957 in connexion with a seminar which he was conducting on the Apostle Paul. He came to feel acutely the need of some comprehensive system of reference to valuable Pauline studies which had appeared over the years in the theological journals in various countries. With the help of his students he set on foot a systematic review of over one hundred and ten different periodicals, published in fourteen different languages. Each publication was examined from its very first issue (in some cases as much as a hundred years ago) right down to 1957, and every article dealing with Paul or his writings carefully catalogued. The references to the various articles are arranged under carefully planned subject headings, with cross references where a single article is relevant to more than one topic. An index of authors whose writings are quoted is also included at the end.

This is an invaluable book for anyone engaged on some aspect of Pauline research, and will save innumerable hours of tedious individual investigation. Any Pauline specialist will want to have a copy of it on his own shelves, and every theological library will require it for the benefit of advanced students.

C. L. MITTON

### WORDS AND THEIR MEANING

*The Bible Word Book*, by Ronald Bridges and Luther A. Weigle (Nelson; 36s. net), has as its sub-title 'Concerning Obsolete or Archaic Words in the King James Version of the Bible', and this sub-title adequately explains the nature and



substance of the book. In the Preface it is said: 'This book is concerned with words used in the King James Version of the Bible which have become obsolete or archaic, or have changed in meaning or acquired new meanings, so that they no longer convey to the reader the sense which the King James translators intended them to express'. This volume owes its title to William Aldis Wright's forerunner of it—'The Bible Word-Book' published in 1884.

There are in this book brief articles on eight hundred and twenty-seven words and phrases. Their aim is both to explain the meaning of the obsolete words and phrases and to indicate how they have been translated in the newer translations.

Here we find that the Bible never uses the word *animal* but always the word *beast*. We find the meaning of the words *brigandine*, *habergeon*, *leasing*, *neesing*, *ouches*, *scall*. *Feeble-minded* does not mean mentally deficient, but rather 'faint-hearted' (1 Th 5<sup>14</sup>). *To fetch a compass* means to take a roundabout course, to make a circuit (Ac 28<sup>13</sup>). In Ac 21<sup>15</sup> to take up our *carriages* means to take up our baggage. Wizards that *peep* and *mutter* are wizards that chirp and mutter (Is 8<sup>19</sup>). That Leah was *tender-eyed* means not that her eyes were melting and doe-like, but that they were weak (Gn 29<sup>17</sup>). A *mansion* simply means a place to stay. The Revised Standard Version translates Jn 14<sup>2</sup> 'In my Father's house are many rooms'. Dr. Weigle tells how an indignant correspondent accused the Revised Standard Version translators of taking the glory out of the Scriptures. The King James Version had promised him *mansions* but in the new translation the *mansions* had shrunk to *rooms*, and the glory is gone!

No doubt this is a useful book for reference and an entertaining volume in which to browse. But there is one very definite complaint. The book is quite unreasonably expensive, especially in view of the fact that it contains nothing but English print. It would in fact be dear at half the price. The public amongst which this book ought to circulate is the lay public, for the Bible students know it all already, and from this public this book will be automatically excluded because of its price.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

*The Charities of London 1480-1660*, by Professor W. K. Jordan (Allen and Unwin; 45s. net), is the second volume of a great work on philanthropy in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which is going to need at least one more volume for its completion. This one presents a detailed analysis of how at different epochs

different classes of London citizens contributed by direct gift or, more frequently, by the foundation of charitable trusts to social causes such as education, the alleviation of poverty and experiments in social rehabilitation, and that not in London only but all over the country. The wealth of London thus outpoured reflected the aspirations for society of these urban groups and established institutions of long-continuing value. Many interesting points emerge, for instance, 'an immediate and most pronounced quickening of giving for the care of the poor with the advent of the Reformation . . . a heavy proportion of this wealth was now vested in enduring and on the whole skilfully framed endowments'. A colossal amount of research must have gone to the making of this substantial volume which will doubtless prove a rich quarry for later writers.

From Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, we have a book by Professor John Murray of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. Published at \$1.75 it is entitled *Calvin on Scripture and Divine Sovereignty*. It excites in us a two-fold reaction. Its three chapters deal respectively with the teaching of Calvin on the Inspiration of Scripture, the Authority of Scripture, and the Sovereignty of God. We admire Professor Murray's well-informed and careful arguments, though we think not all scholars will follow him all the way. It is one thing, however, to conclude that Calvin held the high doctrine of plenary verbal inspiration and the 'equal ultimacy of the pure sovereignty of God's good pleasure in election and reprobation': it is another thing to hold, as Professor Murray seems to do—we should like to think we have misunderstood him—that these are the teachings of the Bible and part of the Christian message for all time. If this is where neo-Calvinism is leading us, then let us have a neo-liberalism that will expose verbal inspiration as bibliolatry and divine reprobation as blasphemy.

Memories of our youth were stirred within us when we received *Men of the Covenant*, by the late Dr. Alexander Smellie. This handsome and well-illustrated volume, published by the Banner of Truth Trust at 15s. is the tenth edition of a work first issued in 1903. Happy are they whose introduction to the sad yet stirring story of the sufferings of the later Covenanters in Scotland is by way of these brilliant sketches of notable figures of the period.

We have received from the Banner of Truth Trust, London, five large and handsome volumes which are reprints of three works famous in their



day. The first in point of time is John Owen's *The Death of Death in the Death of Christ*. This is a polemical treatise designed to expose the doctrine of universal redemption as unscriptural. It is therefore largely expository, and it makes far from easy reading, but some help is afforded by the analysis which is prefixed to it in this reprint. That analysis we owe, it seems, to Dr. J. I. Packer who writes an illuminating introductory essay and argues strongly for Owen's Calvinistic soteriology as an aid to preaching the gospel. The price is 13s. 6d. net.

The other four volumes consist of reprints of two works emanating from the early Free Church of Scotland: William Cunningham's *Historical Theology* in two volumes, price 30s. the set, and James Bannerman's *The Church of Christ* in two volumes, price 30s. the set. Mr. Iain Murray has written the useful biographical introduction, covering both authors, which is prefixed to both works. Cunningham was a renowned debater as well as a learned theologian. Admirable clarity of mind as well as command of language were his, and in these volumes they are used to expound a succession of systems, but chiefly for the discomfiture of Romanism, Socinianism and Arminianism. The same mastery of the subject and clarity of exposition are to be found in Bannerman's treatise on the nature, powers, ordinances, discipline and government of the Church. Both works set forth Reformed theology, and their republication is a sign of the current neo-Calvinist revival. One could wish that Cunningham and Bannerman had handed on their powers of lucid expression to all their successors. Even readers who in the end cannot accept all their interpretations and conclusions will yet benefit from working through these five volumes.

*Thanks be to God*, by the Rev. Robert H. Rodenmayer (James Clarke; 9s. 6d. net), consists of meditations on the General Thanksgiving in the Book of Common Prayer. So central, however, is thanksgiving to the Christian religion, and such is the insight and originality of the author that his book may be called a simple, fresh and thought-provoking introduction to the Christian life. We trust it may have many readers.

A year ago, when *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*, by Professor Jaroslav Pelikan came to us from its American publisher, we welcomed it in these columns with exceptional commendation. We are glad to know that it has now been published in Great Britain by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton at 16s. net, and we are prepared again to commend it as a work of notable value and importance both for the scholar and for the general reader.

We took up *An Expository Preacher's Notebook*, by the Rev. D. W. Cleverley Ford (Hodder and Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net), with lively anticipation, for its author, now closely associated with the new College of Preachers, is well known as an outstanding expository preacher. In this volume he has given a course of ten sermons on St. Matthew's Gospel, two series of Old Testament studies and a collection of individual sermons. All have a background of thoroughly reliable scholarship. We have selected for quotation in 'The Christian Year' part of the study of 'Solomon the Pompous'.

In the invaluable eleven-page preface Mr. Ford guides the would-be preacher of expository sermons on technique—the selection of the subject, collecting material and how to arrest the attention of hearers. His plea is for preaching which concerns itself with a paragraph or chapter of the Bible or even a book of the Bible rather than one verse. What is the most important reason for expository preaching? Mr. Ford answers: 'It will mean that the people in the pews are not merely offered teaching about God but will be confronted by God Himself in the form of His Word'.

We commend this book wholeheartedly.

In Parts 1 and 2 of *The Book of Exodus*, published by the Paulist Press, New York, in pamphlet form (75 cents each part), Father Roland E. Murphy states that the Book of Exodus, which is dominated by the figure of Moses, represents the crystallization of Israel's early spoken traditions concerning itself and its history; the narratives are interpretative rather than factual; the book is a religious epic. He finds different sources used, each with its different emphases; he believes that the Ten Commandments must have been originally short, succinct commands, like 'Thou shalt not kill'; calls 34<sup>1-28</sup> the Yahwist account of the covenant, parallel to chs. 19-20; and, with reference to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, he makes the comment that the Old Testament makes no attempt to reconcile Divine causality with human freedom. The Introduction to each part is very well done and does not shirk awkward questions of interpretation; the translation used is one which is the copyright of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, and it reads well.

In the Introduction to his book *The Kingdom Within You* (Skeffington; 21s. net) the Rev. Gordon Huelin, Ph.D., quotes the words of our Lord, 'Lo, the kingdom of God is within you', and remarks on the lengthy debate which has unsuccessfully tried to decide whether they mean



'in the midst of you' or 'in your hearts'. He goes on to say, 'either interpretation fits the use of the saying as a title for this volume introducing twelve English classics of devotion, each of which has something to tell concerning "The Kingdom Within You"'.

The twelve selected are the anonymous mediæval 'The Ancren Riwle', 'The Ladder of Perfection' (Hilton), 'Revelations of Divine Love' (Mother Julian), 'The Book of Common Prayer', 'The Private Devotions' of Lancelot Andrews, 'The Country Parson' and 'The Temple' (Herbert), 'The Pilgrim's Progress', 'Holy Living' and 'Holy Dying' (Jeremy Taylor), 'A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life' (Law), 'A Practical View' (Wilberforce), 'The Christian Year' (Keble), and 'Readings in St. John's Gospel' (Temple).

*Devotions of Jonathan Edwards*, compiled by Mr. Ralph G. Turnbull (Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan; \$1.50) contains a hundred and four extracts from his works, each headed up by an appropriate text. Two hundred years have dated his writing, and one often longs for some contact between it and the pressures of life to-day.

*Wesley's Christology: An Interpretation* (Southern Methodist University Press, Dallas, Texas; \$4.50 and the Epworth Press; 30s. net) is an able thesis by Dr. John Deschner, Associate Professor at Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, U.S.A. The work was completed for the doctorate in theology at the University of Basel under the supervision of Karl Barth. Dr. Deschner has gone back to the original sources, especially Wesley's standard 'Notes on the New Testament'. In two hundred and twenty well printed pages he treats the Person of Christ, the States of Christ, the Work of Christ, and the Prophetic, Kingly, and Priestly Work of Christ. He points out that Wesley places a heavy emphasis upon the Divine nature and shows a certain reserve about the humanity, and suggests that this under-emphasis 'accords with an atonement of penal substitution, and an exhibition of the ideal *imago dei* as the norm for sanctification'. 'Wesley', he writes, 'did not receive on May 24, 1738, at about a quarter before nine in the evening, a brand new theology direct from heaven. Rather the old theology was reborn that night, reconciled to God, and a lifelong process of theological sanctification so to speak, began.' On the doctrine of justification he observes that Wesley's opinion of his agreement with Calvin is mistaken. Dr. Deschner's work is full, detailed, and well documented, and it will be welcomed by all close students of Wesley's Christology.

During the East Asia Christian Conference at Kuala Lumpur last year, the opportunity was taken to inaugurate the 'John R. Mott Memorial Lectures'. This first series has been published as *A Decisive Hour for the Christian Mission* (S.C.M.; 5s. net). Occasion and writers are matched with the great man celebrated, as is made clear in Dr. Norman Goodall's tribute to Dr. Mott, related to the significant event in Malaya. The five main lectures deal, in various ways, with the direction and strategy of the Christian Mission to-day; and, as Bishop Sobrepna, Chairman of the Conference, points out, 'the rôle of the Asian churches herein is set in the context of the whole Church rendering her apostolate to the whole world'. The lecturers were Bishop Newbigin, Dr. Visser 'T Hooft, and Dr. D. T. Niles. It would be hard to pick a more significant team. The expectation that this volume will have relevance, insight, and vision is not disappointed. This small book is important and should be studied by all who have a concern for the Church's Mission.

*The Scripture Lesson*, edited by Mr. J. W. Harmer, M.A. (Tyndale Press; 15s. net), is a handbook to the Agreed Syllabuses of Religious Instruction in day schools. It was first published in 1945, but this edition has much additional material and is thoroughly brought up-to-date.

The standpoint of this book is conservative-evangelical, but it must be stressed that there is nothing intolerant in it. It is quite prepared to admit that there are other points of view, and uses appreciatively the work of scholars who do not belong to its own standpoint.

We take as a brief sample the section in the chapter entitled 'The Bible and Some Problems', which deals with Seeming Contradictions. (1) It has to be remembered that the Bible is a translated book, and that English words sometimes do not give the exact equivalent of the ancient languages. For instance, to remember that 'jealous' equals 'zealous' is helpful, when the word is used of God. (2) God's dealings were necessarily adapted to the thoughts and standards of the people with whom He was dealing. (3) We must not confuse the essential meaning of a statement with the Oriental imagery and form in which it may be expressed. (4) We must distinguish between what God allows to happen when men go their own way, and what He deliberately brings to pass, between God's permissive and directive will. (5) We must never forget the influence of Jesus Christ in bringing new standards into the world and into life. As we have said this book is conservative-evangelical in standpoint, but it is not necessary to share its standpoint to appreciate its worth and to be able to use it with the greatest profit.



# The Will of God

## III. In Paul

BY PRINCIPAL JOHN A. ALLAN, M.A., D.D., KNOX COLLEGE, DUNEDIN

### I.

ONE might bring the whole religious and ethical teaching of Paul under the heading, 'The Will of God', and indeed his more explicit references to God's Will can scarcely be appreciated in their full force without a preliminary sketch of this broad background. For Paul God is the God of the Old Testament, living and active, whose will manifests itself in Creation in the ordering of human affairs, in appointing the destiny of men, in command, in judgment, and in mercy; and so Paul's whole thinking about the Christian salvation is bound up with this general conception of God as essentially holy and loving Will. God is 'the personal God, man's Creator, and demands obedience from him'.<sup>1</sup> Everything in salvation depends on the grace of God, and grace is not so much an attitude or quality of God as a factual occurrence or situation brought about by God, an act of God. Our faith in God's grace consists in 'the conviction of being rescued from God's wrath . . . Grace is a single deed . . . God's eschatological deed'.<sup>2</sup> The gospel is the revelation of God's righteousness, and the 'term righteousness stands, not only for a moral attribute but also . . . for an act or activity . . . an activity whereby right is asserted in the deliverance of man from the power of evil'.<sup>3</sup> 'God's righteousness is dynamic—as active as his wrath'.<sup>4</sup> When Paul describes salvation as reconciliation, God is the active party in the reconciling. 'When reconciliation is spoken of in St. Paul, the subject is always God, and the object always man.'<sup>5</sup>

It is thus natural to find Paul insisting that the work of Christ is a manifestation of God's action. God sends (Gal 4<sup>4</sup>), puts forward (Ro 3<sup>25</sup>), makes (2 Co 5<sup>21</sup>), and Christ's giving of Himself is according to the Will (θέλημα) of God (Gal 1<sup>4</sup>). When the atonement effected by Christ is applied to men it is in virtue of the choice of God: election is according to God's purpose (πρόθεσις [Ro 9<sup>11</sup>]), according to His Will (βούλημα [Ro 9<sup>19</sup>]), and He

elects as He wills (θέλω [Ro 9<sup>18, 22</sup>]). This electing Will is applied to individuals when God calls them (καλέω, κλήσις, [Ro 9<sup>11, 24</sup> 11<sup>29</sup>, 1 Co 1<sup>9, 26</sup> 7<sup>17</sup>, 1 Th 2<sup>12</sup> 5<sup>24</sup>, Ph 3<sup>14</sup>]). The whole of the existence of a man as a Christian is brought under the idea of the determining Will of God in Ro 8<sup>30</sup>: 'And those whom he predestined he also called; and those whom he called he also justified; and those whom he justified he also glorified'. Justification is never explicitly referred to the Will of God, but it is always and emphatically the act of God and never the achievement of man.

There are various offices and functions in the Church because God, whose Spirit apportions spiritual gifts to men as He wills (1 Co 12<sup>11</sup>), has appointed men to these offices, and Paul repeatedly ascribes his own office as apostle to the Will of God (1 Co 1<sup>1</sup>, 2 Co 1<sup>1</sup>, Col 1<sup>1</sup>). The same idea he expresses also in terms of calling, setting apart (Ro 1<sup>1</sup>, Gal 1<sup>15-16</sup>). In 2 Co 8<sup>5</sup> Paul says that when he appealed to the Macedonians for support for his collection, they not only gave generously but 'first gave themselves to the Lord and to us by the Will of God'. Apparently this means that some of them accepted the call to special service and offered themselves in accepting the office of delegates to go to Jerusalem to deliver the collection. Plainly for Paul the Will of God is often expressed in terms of a call.

### II.

Not only for Paul is the Will of God 'the soul of history'<sup>6</sup> and especially of the history of salvation, but when it touches the life of a man as a call it is always a call to a specific kind of life. It is expressed in ethical demands. In this way of speaking of the Will of God Paul, of course, is following his Master (Mt 6<sup>10</sup> 7<sup>21</sup>, Mk 3<sup>35</sup>). So, too, the Jewish rabbis of the day spoke.<sup>7</sup> It will be enough if we cite the relevant passages from the Epistles and add a few comments.

Romans 12<sup>2</sup>. The Will of God is here defined as what is good, acceptable, perfect, and the doing of it is said to spring from the renewing of the mind and the surrender of the whole personality

<sup>6</sup> W. M. Ramsay, *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, 91.

<sup>7</sup> J. Bonsirven, *Textes Rabbiniques*, xiv, 41.

<sup>1</sup> R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, i, 228.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, 288-289.

<sup>3</sup> C. H. Dodd, *Epistle to the Romans* [Moffatt Commentary], 10, 12.

<sup>4</sup> G. Schrenk, *Bible Key Words: Righteousness*, 43.

<sup>5</sup> J. Denney, *The Death of Christ*, 143.



to God. The adjectives used tell us how we are to seek to be conformed to this Will; 'good': we must act in a way that is beneficial to others (cf. 1 Th 5<sup>15</sup>); 'acceptable': our actions must be directed towards pleasing God; 'perfect': our activity must be carried through consistently to its completion, and must not be simply a matter of good intentions.<sup>1</sup>

1 Thessalonians 4<sup>3-8</sup>. Here the Will of God is described as directed towards a special problem of conduct, the temptation to sexual indulgence, and its demand is that we should abstain from immorality. God's Will here is more than a demand. It is an active impulsion aimed at securing the complete consecration of the believer. G. Milligan in his well known Commentary describes it as 'not only God's commanding but his enabling Will'. In v. 7 Paul expresses the same idea in other words when he says that God has called us to consecration. The same definitely ethical meaning of 'call' is found in 1 Co 7<sup>15</sup>, 'God has called us to peace'—not peace of heart or peace with God, but in this case concord with those with whom our lives are linked. Notice also how the idea of the enabling, energizing, ethical Will of God is implied in Ph 2<sup>13</sup>, 'For God is at work in you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure'.

Colossians 1<sup>9-10</sup>. Here the thought of God's Will is placed in a very rich setting. It is made quite plain that the Will of God is a demand for a good life, a life 'worthy of the Lord, fully pleasing to him, bearing fruit in every good work'. This ethical activity is also a religious activity. Spiritual wisdom and understanding are needed if we are to know the Will of God, and our obedience must be accompanied by an increasing knowledge of God. The glorious might of God must strengthen us for it, and it rests on the deliverance and forgiveness wrought for us through Christ (vv. 11-14).

Colossians 4<sup>12</sup>. Paul tells the Colossians that Epaphras prays for them 'that you may stand mature and fully assured in all the will of God', or better, 'in everything that God wills'. This is probably to be understood as a prayer for ethical soundness according to the ethic taught by Paul (Col 3<sup>1-4</sup>.<sup>2</sup>) as contrasted with the ascetic prescriptions condemned in the Epistle, regulations that 'are of no value in checking the indulgence of the flesh' (2<sup>16-23</sup>).<sup>2</sup>

1 Thessalonians 5<sup>18</sup>. In this text the Will of God demands rejoicing, constant prayer and thanksgiving, and Paul adds that this Will of God is 'in Christ Jesus', that is, it is revealed in

Christ's example and teaching, and the doing of it depends on His redeeming work.

It is perhaps worth noting that for all Paul's vigorous polemic against legalism in religion he can describe the Mosaic Law as the Will of God (Ro 2<sup>18</sup>), and can call the fundamental demands of God, God's law (Ro 8<sup>7</sup>).

### III.

It is clear that Paul regarded all his missionary work and the activities of those under his direction as being ordained and controlled by the Will of God. The general scope of his activity in its universal outreach to the Gentiles he ascribes to the specific call and direction of God (Gal 1<sup>15</sup>). God has chosen to make known that this preaching to the Gentiles is His Will and has given Paul the divine office of apostleship to the Gentiles (Col 1<sup>25-27</sup>). It has pleased God by this preaching to save men (1 Co 1<sup>21</sup>). But of course against this general background of direction by God's Will, many particular decisions had to be made as to spheres of work, departures, routes, length of stay and so on. How did Paul ascertain God's Will in such matters? How did he understand His 'guidance' as to the Will of God for the movements of his missionary activity?

In the first place, it is quite clear that all his plans were formed and announced subject to the great qualification, 'if the Lord wills' (Ro 1<sup>10</sup> 15<sup>32</sup>, 1 Co 4<sup>19</sup>). Although in Paul's writing 'the Lord' is Christ, this does not affect the argument, since in 1 Th 3<sup>11</sup> he speaks of God the Father and the Lord Jesus as jointly directing his way. All is subject to the divine over-ruling. Other passages differently phrased carry the same implication (Ph 2<sup>19</sup>.<sup>24</sup>, Philem 22). This we might describe as Paul's subjection to the permissive Will of God. This is far from being a kind of Stoic resignation to the inevitable ordering of things. Lagrange quotes Seneca: 'Let what has pleased God please men', and Epictetus: 'Will nothing but what God wills', and adds, 'But this teaching is singularly obscured by determinism'.<sup>3</sup> Paul's acceptance of God's Will is quite different in spirit, because his conception of God's Will is quite different from the Stoic conception. His plans are formed to carry out the general purpose he assuredly knows as God's Will, an active, living, personal Will directed towards the spread of the gospel through Paul's work, and Paul submits to God's Will when it over-rules his own plans, because in this way the main purpose of his work will be effected the more surely. Since he regards his work as part of the great struggle

<sup>1</sup> F.-J. Leenhardt, *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Romains*, 172.

<sup>2</sup> T. K. Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians* (I.C.C.), 301.

<sup>3</sup> *Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*, 129.



against the powers of evil, which though defeated on the Cross are not yet rendered inoperative, it is not surprising to find that once he ascribes the thwarting of his plans not to God but to Satan (1 Th 2<sup>18</sup>). 1 Corinthians 16<sup>12</sup> may probably be taken as a further indication of Paul's ideas in this connexion. The Revised Standard Version translates, I think rightly, 'As for our brother Apollos, I strongly urged him to visit you with the other brethren, but it was not at all God's will for him to go now. He will come when he has opportunity.' In this verse the word *θέλημα* is used without any qualifying word so that the reference might be to the will of Apollos, and many commentators understand it so. But more likely it means God's Will, as in Ro 2<sup>18</sup>, where again the word is used without a qualifying word and can only mean God's Will. So too 'the wrath' is used without qualification to mean God's wrath in Ro 5<sup>9</sup> and 1 Th 2<sup>16</sup>. The same absolute use of 'the will' is found in the Codex Vaticanus in Eccles 43<sup>16</sup>, while 1 Mac 3<sup>60</sup> has 'the will in heaven'.

But to return to the question as to how Paul came to know what God's Will was in particular cases, it is important to notice that in Acts we are repeatedly told that he was guided by special supernatural communications. At three notable points in the story Acts records such immediate guidance, 13<sup>2</sup> 16<sup>6-10</sup> and 20<sup>22</sup> (see also Ac 18<sup>9-11</sup> 19<sup>21</sup> 22<sup>17-21</sup> 23<sup>11</sup> 27<sup>23-26</sup>). That Acts is substantially true to fact in this picture of Paul we need not doubt, for Paul reveals himself to us in his epistles as a man endowed with exceptional psychic powers and subject to extraordinary psychic experiences (1 Co 5<sup>3-5</sup> 14<sup>18</sup>, 2 Co 12<sup>1-4</sup>).<sup>1</sup> In particular he ascribes one of his important acts directly to a revelation (Gal 2<sup>2</sup>), that is, 'a disclosure of the divine will respecting a specific matter'.<sup>2</sup>

What chiefly impresses us in this connexion, however, is Paul's capacity for estimating these abnormal powers and experiences at their true value, see 1 Co 12-14. His discussion of his 'thorn in the flesh' shows his attitude clearly. He was led by a direct divine communication to put away his rebellious attitude to this affliction, but it is his rational judgment that accepts it. He sees not just an unintelligible will imposed upon him, but a loving Will which thus provides a check to his tendency to boast and a way by which he may experience the divine power more fully. (2 Co 12<sup>1-10</sup>). A revelation leads him to go up to Jerusalem to meet the older apostles (Gal 2<sup>2</sup>), but the rational purpose is perfectly clear; for he adds at once 'lest somehow I should be running or had

run in vain'. The most elaborate account of special guidance is in Ac 16<sup>6-10</sup>, the story of how Paul moved into Europe. We have first the series of negative leadings that brought him to Troas. The matter is not mentioned in the Epistles, but we are tempted to speculate as to the meaning of these revelations of God's Will. Foakes Jackson<sup>3</sup> suggests that as a result of the debates that led up to the Apostolic Council of Ac 15 the Jewish communities in the regions Paul desired to enter had become thoroughly alarmed, and so the usual base of operations in the synagogues was closed to Paul for the time being. All we can say is that probably some such set of outward circumstances made a successful mission unlikely or impossible. The vision of the man of Macedonia was decisive for Paul, but his mind must have been turning to Europe as a future sphere of work. Johannes Munck<sup>4</sup> has powerfully illustrated Paul's basic conviction that God had assigned to him the centrally important task of establishing representative groups of believers in every land, so that the gospel might be thus preached to all the Gentiles and the conditions for the Lord's Parousia accordingly be fulfilled. The vision only confirmed what the other circumstances indicated, namely that the time for this advance into Europe, which was certainly intended by Paul in due course, had now actually arrived. It is also striking that Acts records one occasion on which Paul received a divine instruction at the mouths of the inspired men of the Church and refused to obey it (Ac 21<sup>4</sup>). Speaking in the name of the Holy Spirit, they forbade him to go to Jerusalem, but apparently it had 'seemed advisable' to Paul to go in person with the gift of the Gentile churches (1 Co 16<sup>7</sup>), and this, be it noted, was in carrying out a task not suggested to him in the first place by a revelation but by the request of the Jerusalem apostles (Gal 2<sup>10</sup>).

More important for our present enquiry are the passages in which Paul discusses his plans and lets us see the considerations that led him to form them. In the background always is his overpowering sense of obligation to preach the gospel to every nation, and then two powerful subsidiary considerations come into play: the leading of circumstances, and his deep personal affection and concern for his converts. In 1 Th 3<sup>1-5</sup> his warm human feeling and his passion for maintaining his churches are shown as determining his decision as to the movements of Timothy. He could not any longer bear the anxiety of not knowing how things were going in Thessalonica. It is warm human feeling for a helper that makes him decide to send Epaphroditus back to Philippi (Ph 2<sup>25-30</sup>). His

<sup>1</sup> See R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, 337-341.

<sup>2</sup> E. D. Burton, *Galatians* (I.C.C.), 70.

<sup>3</sup> *The Life of Saint Paul*, 151.

<sup>4</sup> *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*.



decision to forgive the offender in Corinth is described in a significant double way: it is dictated by love for the Corinthians ('for your sake'), and it is a decision taken 'in the presence of Christ', which surely means, 'with a full sense of responsibility to Christ and in a desire to act according to His mind and in His spirit', rather than, 'under immediate inspiration from Christ' (2 Co 2<sup>10</sup>).

In four passages Paul discusses his plans and explains his motives in some detail, and in each case without any reference to direct particular guidance. (a) Ro 15<sup>14-23</sup>. Here Paul explains the point reached in the special missionary activity appointed for him by God, and so justifies his plan for work in Spain by way of Rome. (b) 1 Co 16<sup>1-9</sup>. This passage points to what we might call ordinary, commonsense, tentative planning. Notice the phraseology: 'If it seems advisable', 'I intend', 'Perhaps I will stay', 'I hope to spend some time'. The delay at Ephesus until Pentecost is explained as justified because of the great evangelistic opportunity presented there. (c) 2 Co 1<sup>15-24</sup>. This is a very interesting passage because in it Paul explains and justifies a double change of plan on account of which he had been adversely criticized by the Corinthians. It seems that he had at first meant to return to Corinth by way of Macedonia (1 Co 16<sup>5</sup>), but the troubles in Corinth led him to cross directly by sea for a visit not mentioned in Acts but definitely implied in 2 Co 2<sup>1</sup> 12<sup>14</sup> 13<sup>1-2</sup>. This change of plan he does not defend in the passage we are discussing. Its motive must have been plain to the Corinthians whether they approved or not. Then he must have given the impression that he meant to return quite soon direct to Corinth; but he changed his mind, wrote a letter instead, and sent Titus as his delegate, while he himself took the land route through Troas and Macedonia. This evidently led to a charge of vacillation (2 Co 1<sup>17</sup>). There is much difference of opinion among scholars as to the details of Paul's relations with Corinth at this stage, but it is enough for our present purpose to note that he was criticized by the Corinthians for some change of plan. We notice that in his explanation he makes no appeal to any special divine guidance that he may have received, although such an appeal would have been a very decisive answer to his critics. He explains his change of plan as due to love for the Corinthians. After he left Corinth either he heard that things had become worse, or on mature consideration he realized that a speedy visit would only make matters worse. He probably felt that a visit at this stage would do more harm than good. The previous visit had been painful to all, and to rush too soon into a personal encounter with the

rebellious Church would only further embitter relations between him and them. He therefore deemed it wiser to send a letter and Titus. So he cancelled his plan for a visit and decided to wait till he heard the result of this letter and the visit of Titus. His decision rested on his deep desire to restore friendship and to draw the Church back into loyalty. His own personal distress at the quarrel made it impossible for him to meet them again face to face while feeling ran so high. (d) 2 Co 2<sup>12-13</sup>. Here we have another striking minor change of plan. Paul had evidently arranged to meet Titus at Troas, and he had every inducement to adhere to that plan because the evangelistic opportunity was great 'in the Lord', that is, the favourable circumstances pointed to the Will of Christ in the matter. Yet Paul went on to Macedonia, simply because his concern for the Corinthian Church tormented him so that he could not settle to work but hurried forward on the route so as to meet Titus and hear his report the sooner. If his letter and Titus's visit had failed, the Church at Corinth would practically cease to exist as a Christian force, and he would have to excommunicate them and hand them over to Satan's realm.<sup>1</sup> His passionate concern for his dear friends and his anxiety for the continuance of the Christian cause in Corinth made it impossible for him to consider any other service of Christ in the meantime.<sup>2</sup> Nothing could show more clearly that Paul was no fanatic, depending blindly on direct, particular guidance, and unshakably confident in that guidance.

A beautiful insight into Paul's mind is provided by a passage in many ways rather curious, Ph 1<sup>19-26</sup>. He weighs the prospect of life or death as the outcome of his imprisonment, and speaks as if the decision rests with himself! No doubt, as F. C. Synge says, 'Paul knows that in fact the choice of life or death is not offered to him, but it pleases him to balance the two delights'.<sup>3</sup> What concerns us here is that he claims no special revelation or guidance as to the future, but he is determined in his attitude on the one hand by the passionate desire for closer union with Christ and on the other by his loving concern for the Philippians.

Clearly the supernatural and abnormal psychic experiences that played an important part in Paul's spiritual life were vigorously subordinated by him to the sense of God's general direction in his apostolic calling, and were controlled by reference to the leading of circumstances, by emotional factors of love and care for his converts and by rational considerations of clear judgment.

<sup>1</sup> J. Munck, *op. cit.*, 190.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, 192.

<sup>3</sup> *Philippians and Colossians* (*The Torch Bible Commentary*).



# Hellenistic Thought in New Testament Times

## The Way of Tranquillity

### The Epicureans—III.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM BARCLAY, D.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

IT was the claim of the Epicureans that 'they were freed from the most cruel of tyrants, eternal terror and fear by night and day'.<sup>1</sup> We have already seen how Epicurus sought to free men from the universal fear of death by teaching that the soul, like everything else in this world, is no more than a fortuitous conglomeration of atoms, and that at death the atoms of the soul are simply liberated and fly away. Death is nothingness and in death there is in the most literal sense nothing to fear.

But there was another fear from which men must be liberated, the fear of the gods. As Epicurus saw it, 'the great enemy of ataraxy is religion'.<sup>2</sup> As Lucretius saw it, Epicurus' greatest claim to fame and to thanksgiving was that he had destroyed religion. 'When man's life lay for all to see foully grovelling on the ground, crushed beneath the weight of religion, . . . a man of Greece was the first that dared to uplift mortal eyes against her, the first to make stand against her. . . . Wherefore religion is now in her turn cast down and trampled underfoot, whilst we by the victory are exalted high as heaven.'<sup>3</sup>

Epicurus never denied the existence of the gods, but he did most strenuously deny that the gods are as they are popularly supposed to be. 'Not the man who denies the gods worshipped by the multitude, but he who affirms of the gods what the multitude believes about them is truly impious.'<sup>4</sup>

It was the first principle of Epicurus that the gods enjoyed the perfect *ἀταξία*, the perfect tranquillity and calm, and for that very reason they could never be involved in the governing and ordering of the world. If the gods were involved in the ordering and the sustaining of the world, and in the affairs of men, they would be overworked, prying, busybodies, whose peace would be for ever gone.<sup>5</sup> Nor can the gods ever

feel any emotion, such as anger at the sinner or joy at the good man, for emotion is the very thing which disturbs life and which takes tranquillity away. The first of the Sovereign Maxims runs: 'The blessed and immortal nature knows no trouble, nor causes trouble to any other, so that it is never constrained by anger or by favour. For all such things exist only in the weak.'<sup>6</sup> Lucretius writes: 'The very nature of divinity must necessarily enjoy immortal life in the deepest peace, far removed and separated from our troubles; for without any pain, without danger, itself mighty by its own resources, needing us not at all, it is not propitiated by services or touched by wrath.'<sup>7</sup> The fact that makes the gods gods is their complete and utter detachment from life and from the world. They live out in the *intermundia*, 'where no winds ever shake or clouds besprinkle with rain, which no snow congealed by the bitter frost mars with its white fall, but the air ever-cloudless encompasses them, and laughs with its light spread abroad. There nature supplies everything, and nothing impairs their peace.'<sup>8</sup>

Apart from that argument, Epicurus argued that we have only to look at the world to see that the gods are not remotely interested in it. The wicked flourish and the good perish. Nature is hostile. The blast of the thunderbolt strikes the very temples of the gods. Clearly there is no divine ordering or intervention in a world like this.<sup>9</sup>

So the gods live, utterly and absolutely and essentially detached, out in the spaces between the worlds. They are made of the finest of atoms, and they are immortal, although their atoms could never survive in a world so coarse as ours. They never sleep, for they never toil and are never weary. Their food and their houses are such as befit perfect blessedness. They can speak, and they do speak a language like Greek, for without speech they would be despoiled of the great gift of talking with their equals. They are for ever and for ever serene in undisturbed contemplation

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, I. xxi. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Paul Elmer More, *The Hellenistic Philosophies: The Greek Tradition*, ii. 38.

<sup>3</sup> Lucretius, i. 62-79.

<sup>4</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 123; Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, I. xvi. 42.

<sup>5</sup> Lucretius, v. 156 ff; Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, I. xix. 50-56.

<sup>6</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 139.

<sup>7</sup> Lucretius, ii. 646-651.

<sup>8</sup> Lucretius, iii. 18-24.

<sup>9</sup> Lucretius, ii. 1090-1104.



of their own blessedness.<sup>1</sup> Seneca describes the Epicurean gods as caring nothing for men and turning their backs upon the world, concerned with neither benefits nor injuries, enjoying the supreme happiness of being involved in no action at all.<sup>2</sup>

It is small wonder that the Epicureans gained a reputation for atheism. Lucian, who venerated Epicurus for his gallant stand against superstition and his adamant stand against all that Lucian regarded as humbug, shows us Alexander the false prophet warning off the atheists, the Christians, and the Epicureans, before he begins his rites. He shows us Zeus in heaven looking towards a sorrowful time when the temples will be empty, when there will be no more sacrifices, and when 'the Epicuruses, the Metrodoruses and the Damises will be laughing at us'.<sup>3</sup>

Clearly this belief in the detachment of the gods leaves no room for any such thing as divination, or for prayer, or for prophecy, or for belief in daemons. 'It is vain to ask the gods,' said Epicurus, 'for what a man is capable of supplying himself.'<sup>4</sup> And he remarks caustically: 'If God listened to the prayers of men, all men would quickly have perished; for they are for ever praying for evil against one another'.<sup>5</sup>

It is with a view to proving this detachment of the gods that Epicurus did believe in the study of Nature. The twelfth of the Sovereign Maxims runs: 'A man cannot dispel his fear about the most important matters, if he does not know what is the nature of the universe, but suspects the truth of some mythical story. So without natural science it is not possible to attain our pleasure unalloyed.'<sup>6</sup> The Letter to Pythocles is written to prove that all natural phenomena are natural phenomena and that it is useless folly to introduce God to explain them.<sup>7</sup>

Epicurus does not attempt to give any one exclusively true explanation of any natural phenomenon; he is quite willing to say that there may be many explanations, but the actions of the gods are never one of them.<sup>8</sup> The rising and the setting of the sun and the moon and the stars may be due to kindling or quenching, or to their

coming forward above the earth and their going round behind it, or to the rotation of the whole heavens, or to their own rotation. Thunder may be due to the rolling of the winds in the hollow part of the clouds, or to the roaring of fire in them when it is fanned by the wind, or to the rending and disruption of the clouds, or to their friction and splitting when they have become as firm as ice.<sup>9</sup> The one explanation which must never be introduced is the action of God. God is banished from the universe.

It might be thought surprising in view of all this that Epicurus never abandons belief in the gods, and that he was quite prepared to take his part in the conventional ceremonies of religion.<sup>10</sup> He can even talk of the wise man holding a holy belief concerning the gods.<sup>11</sup> But there were three reasons why Epicurus retained a belief in the existence of the gods. First, belief in the gods is a universal belief, a *πρόληψις*, and cannot therefore be abandoned.<sup>12</sup> Second, if all knowledge comes from sensation, and if there can be no sensation without some real body to give off the films and images which lodge in the eye and the mind, then there must be gods, because men have the sensation that there are gods.<sup>13</sup> Thirdly, since human *ἀταραξία*, human tranquillity, is necessarily always incomplete, it is necessary to postulate the existence of some beings who really and truly do enjoy the supreme blessedness.

Here then is the teaching of Epicurus about the gods. There are gods, but they are utterly and completely detached from the world; they have no interest in the world or in man; and would certainly work no man ill. Their detachment is the very condition of their divinity.

So Epicurus banished from life the fear of death and the fear of the gods. Death is literally nothing, and the gods do not enter into life at all. Why then should any man be afraid? So now we must go on finally to see that kind of life which Epicurus wished men to live, and which he himself succeeded in living.

Plutarch called Epicurus 'the great pattern and maintainer of pleasure',<sup>14</sup> because for Epicurus the supreme good is pleasure.<sup>15</sup> Pleasure is the alpha and the omega of the blessed life.<sup>16</sup> It is the moving power of every choice, 'the first and

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, I. xviii, 49, I. xxv. 71, I. xxvi. 74, II. xxiii. 59; Lucretius, v. 148; Philodemus, quoted in E. Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics*, 468, 469.

<sup>2</sup> Seneca, *On Benefits*, IV. iv. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Lucian, *Alexander the False Prophet*, 17, 25, 38, 47; *Zeus Rants*, 22; *The Double Indictment*, 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Fragment*, lxx.

<sup>5</sup> *Fragment*, 58.

<sup>6</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 143.

<sup>7</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 97.

<sup>8</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 78, 85.

<sup>9</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 91-96, 101-105.

<sup>10</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 120.

<sup>11</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 133.

<sup>12</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 123; Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, I. xvi. 43.

<sup>13</sup> Lucretius, v. 76; Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, I. xviii. 46.

<sup>14</sup> Plutarch, *Tranquillity and Contentment*, 157.

<sup>15</sup> Lucian, *Hermotimus*, 36.

<sup>16</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 128.



native good', a fact which needs no proof, for from the day of birth every living creature desires pleasure and seeks to avoid pain.<sup>1</sup>

Sometimes Epicurus spoke as if the pleasure desired was purely physical, sensuous and even sensual pleasure. 'I do not know', he said, 'how I can conceive the good, if I withdraw the pleasures of taste, and of love, and of hearing and the pleasurable emotions caused to sight by beautiful form.'<sup>2</sup> 'The beginning and the root of all good', he said, 'is the pleasure of the belly; even wisdom and culture must be referred to this.'<sup>3</sup> Beauty and virtue are only to be honoured, if they give pleasure; if they do not, we must bid them farewell.<sup>4</sup> Epicurus writes to Aristarchus: 'I summon you to continuous pleasure and not to vain and empty virtues which have only disturbing hopes of results'.<sup>5</sup> Epicurus had no one to blame but himself, if he was regarded as a sensual hedonist.

But into this principle of pleasure two other principles enter. The wise man always takes the long view of pleasure. He thinks not only of the pleasure of the moment but of the consequences of pleasure. Hence many pleasures will be rejected because of the pain they bring, and many pains will be accepted because of the ultimate pleasure they bring.<sup>6</sup> All pleasure is good, but not all pleasure deserves to be chosen; all pain is evil, but all pain is not to be refused. The eighth of the Sovereign Maxims lays it down: 'No pleasure is a bad thing in itself; but the means which produce some pleasures bring with them disturbances many times greater than the pleasure'.<sup>7</sup> Every desire has to be confronted with the question, what happens if it is satisfied, and what happens if it is not satisfied?<sup>8</sup> This introduces a new and overriding principle. 'When', says Epicurus, 'we maintain that pleasure is the end, we do not mean the pleasure of the profligate and those that consist in sensuality, as is supposed by some who are ignorant or disagree with us or do not understand.'<sup>9</sup>

A second principle enters in. With Plato Epicurus saw that before there can be a positive pleasure, there must be a pain, a want, a desire to be satisfied. The real satisfaction is not the pleasure itself, but the removal of the want or the

pain. So, then, the end which Epicurus desires is not the incidental pleasure, nor a series of pleasures; it is the state of mind in which there is calm content. The real aim of action is to be free from pain and fear, to be in a state in which the tempest of the soul is stilled.<sup>10</sup> The central Epicurean definition is: 'By pleasure we mean the absence of pain in the body and trouble in the mind'.<sup>11</sup> Again and again and again Epicurus insists that pleasure is an attitude and condition of mind.<sup>12</sup> It is better to be free of fear lying on a pallet than to have a golden couch and a rich table and be full of trouble. The really wise man has attained to such a condition and attitude of mind that he will still be perfectly happy in the brazen bull of Phalaris or on the rack.<sup>13</sup> It is this completely calm and tranquil and desireless attitude and condition of mind which is *ἀταραξία*, which for Epicurus is the supreme goal of life. For most men rest is stagnation and activity is madness.<sup>14</sup> For the Epicurean wise man life is a divine calm.

Let us then analyse this calm and tranquil attitude and condition of mind.

It is the attitude which has *learned content*. Nothing satisfies the man who is not satisfied with a little.<sup>15</sup> It is the man who needs least to-morrow who will most gladly go to meet to-morrow.<sup>16</sup> He enjoys wealth most who needs it least, and the man who does not find his own resources ample can get the whole world and still be wretched.<sup>17</sup> Epicurus could also say: 'My crown is called content'.

It is the quality of mind which *accepts Nature*, and Nature's needs and pleasures and has nothing to do with the artificial and synthetic needs and luxuries of life. 'If you live according to Nature you will never be poor; if you live according to opinion you will never be rich.'<sup>18</sup>

It has learned that *the real necessities are all simple and easy to obtain*. Nature is blessed because she has made what is necessary easy to supply, and what is not easy unnecessary.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 128.

<sup>11</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 131; Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, ed. J. E. King, xix; 'not the excitement of the moment, but permanent tranquil satisfaction'.

<sup>12</sup> *Fragment*, II, 48, 85.

<sup>13</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 118; Seneca, *Moral Letters*, lxvi. 18, lxxvii. 15; Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, II. vii. 17.

<sup>14</sup> *Fragment*, II.

<sup>15</sup> *Fragment*, 69; Plutarch, *The Tranquillity of the Mind*, 474 C.

<sup>16</sup> *Fragment*, 78.

<sup>17</sup> Seneca, *Moral Letters*, ix. 20, xiv. 17.

<sup>18</sup> Seneca, *Moral Letters*, xvi. 7; *Fragment*, 45.

<sup>19</sup> *Fragment*, 67, 71; Diogenes Laertius, x. 130-132.

<sup>1</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 129.

<sup>2</sup> *Fragment*, 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Fragment*, 59.

<sup>4</sup> *Fragment*, 12.

<sup>5</sup> *Fragment*, 23.

<sup>6</sup> *Fragment*, 129, 60.

<sup>7</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 141; Seneca, *On Leisure*, vii 3.

<sup>8</sup> *Fragment*, lxxi.

<sup>9</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 131.



It has undergone the greatest of liberations, *the liberation from desire*. 'If you want to make Pythocles happy', Epicurus said, 'add not to his possessions, but take away from his desires.'<sup>1</sup>

It is the quality of mind which has learned that *riches are useless to beget happiness*. Riches do not provide an escape from ills, but only greater ills.<sup>2</sup> 'Poverty, when measured by the natural purpose of life, is great wealth, but unlimited wealth is great poverty.'<sup>3</sup>

It has learned that *physical love and desire cannot beget happiness*. The wise man will not fall in love.<sup>4</sup> The pleasures of love never profited any man, and he is lucky if they do him no harm.<sup>5</sup>

It has *rid itself of envy*. The good do not deserve envy, and the more the bad prosper, the more they injure themselves.<sup>6</sup> Envy is the great destroyer of peace of heart.

It has *thrown away ambition*. The Epicurean never took part in 'the prison-house' of politics and public affairs.<sup>7</sup> Nothing is so destructive of peace as to meddle in public affairs. The Epicurean motto is *Ἄθεε βίωσας*, Live Unseen.<sup>8</sup>

The supreme aim is *αὐταρκεία*, complete self-sufficiency and independence of all outward circumstances. 'Αὐταρκεία is the greatest of all riches.<sup>9</sup> When a man has *αὐταρκεία* there is nothing that he needs or desires.<sup>10</sup> The greatest fruit of *αὐταρκεία* is perfect freedom.<sup>11</sup> And in this Epicurus practised what he preached, for it was said of him: 'Epicurus' life, when compared to other men's in respect of *αὐταρκεία* and gentleness, might be thought a mere legend'.<sup>12</sup>

It can easily be seen that the 'pleasure' of Epicureanism is not a sensual but a noble thing.

Into the pattern of Epicureanism there come virtue and justice. For the Epicurean virtue is a necessity for without virtue there can be no such thing as pleasure, and with virtue pleasure is sure and certain.<sup>13</sup> Epicurus' view of virtue is

purely utilitarian; there is no value whatever in virtue as such; its only value lies in the fact that it is an adjunct and an ally of happiness.

It is so with justice. For Epicurus justice is not absolute; it is simply a contract which men have made with each other for their mutual good and profit.<sup>14</sup> Epicurus lays it down quite bluntly that a man must abstain from evil-doing, not because evil-doing is wrong, but because he may be found out, and, even if he is not found out, he will be in constant fear that he will be, and will therefore never be able to be happy.<sup>15</sup> Justice is no more than a utilitarian agreement, and the observing of it is no more than a matter of expediency.

One of the loveliest things in Epicureanism is the beauty of its friendships, and one of the ugliest things is its ostensible view of friendship. Even the most self-sufficient man needs a friend.<sup>16</sup> No life can be blessed without friendship which is the greatest thing in the world.<sup>17</sup> Wisdom and friendship are the two great things, and wisdom is a mortal good and friendship an immortal good.<sup>18</sup> No man should ever eat a meal alone, for so to eat is to eat like a beast.<sup>19</sup> And yet Epicurus taught that friendship is entirely based on self-interest; it is prompted by our needs.<sup>20</sup> It is for pay that a father loves his son, a mother her child, children their parents.<sup>21</sup> We have friends entirely for what we can get out of them. True, a man will suffer and even die for his friend—but only because he would be unhappier if he did not.<sup>22</sup>

The extraordinary thing about Epicureanism is how its devotees lived the loveliest life from the worst of motives, and how in some astonishing way they achieved selflessness by the way of selfishness.

There is undoubtedly a certain beauty in the picture of the gentle Epicurus and in his teaching. Epicureanism lasted for centuries and numbered among its devotees great men like Caius Cassius, the assassinator of Caesar, and Titus Pomponius Atticus, the close friend of Cicero.<sup>23</sup> But in the end it perished, for men would not buy happiness and peace at the price of the death of the soul, the banishment of God, and the erection of prudent selfishness into the mainspring of life.

<sup>14</sup> The Sovereign Maxims, 17, 31, 32, 33, 34; Fragment, 81, 82.

<sup>15</sup> Fragment, 2, 7; Seneca, *Moral Letters*, xcvi. 13.

<sup>16</sup> Seneca, *Moral Letters*, ix. 1.

<sup>17</sup> Sovereign Maxims, 27; Diogenes Laertius, x. 148.

<sup>18</sup> Fragment, lxxviii.; cf. Fragment, lii., Fragment, 50, Fragment, xxix., xxxiv.

<sup>19</sup> Seneca, *Moral Letters*, xix. 10.

<sup>20</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 120.

<sup>21</sup> Plutarch, *On Affection for Offspring*, 495 A.

<sup>22</sup> Fragment, xxviii., lvi., lvii.

<sup>23</sup> L. Robin, *Greek Thought*, 325.

<sup>1</sup> Fragment, 28; Seneca, *Moral Letters*, xxi. 9; Fragment, xlvi.

<sup>2</sup> Fragment, 72. Seneca, *Moral Letters*, xvii. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Fragment, xxv, xliii.

<sup>4</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 118, 119.

<sup>5</sup> Fragment, li., xviii.

<sup>6</sup> Fragment, liii.

<sup>7</sup> Fragment, xlviii.; Seneca, *On Leisure*, iii. 2; Plutarch, *Tranquillity of Mind*, 466 A.

<sup>8</sup> Seneca, *Moral Letters*, lxxviii. 10; Fragment, 68.

<sup>9</sup> Fragment, 70.

<sup>10</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 120.

<sup>11</sup> Fragment, lxxvii.; cf. Fragment, 29, Fragment, xlv.; Diogenes Laertius, x. 130.

<sup>12</sup> Fragment, xxxvi.

<sup>13</sup> Diogenes Laertius, x. 138; Seneca, *Moral Letters*, lxxxv. 18; The Sovereign Maxims, 5; Diogenes Laertius, x. 140.



## In the Study

### Virginibus Puerisque

#### Sleeping Angels

BY THE REVEREND PETER W. E. DOIDGE, ANNFIELD PLAIN

'And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him [Gideon].'—Jg 6<sup>12</sup>.

EVERY Christmas in London the main streets are decorated with many kinds of festive decorations, and in the evenings they are lit up, to form a sparkling fairyland. Boys and girls like to walk along the streets and gaze upwards at the wonderful display. One little girl was standing with her mother looking at one part of the decorations, but something had gone wrong. They were angels blowing trumpets, but they were not lit up and looked very dull amid all the shining lights. The little girl said, 'Look, Mummy, they've fallen asleep!' They were sleeping angels!

There seems something wrong with sleeping angels, doesn't there? Whenever we read of angels in the Bible they are always busy. They are God's messengers and have no time to fall asleep because they go on His errands. Sometimes they are sent to call someone to a special task, like the angel who came to Gideon when the children of Israel were oppressed by the Midianites. Sometimes they are sent to tell men some great news, like the angel who spoke to the startled shepherds on the hills near Bethlehem and told them of the birth of Jesus—'Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all the people'. Angels are always busy, for they work for God.

Would you like to be an angel? You can be one, and God wants you to be one. You see, the word 'angel' also means 'messenger'. Now God wants messengers on earth as well as in heaven. He wants people who are willing to serve Him, and boys and girls who are willing to do His errands. God works to-day through His Church and the Church is made up of people who love Him and want to serve Him. When you become a follower of Jesus and join the Church you become one of His messengers and you share in His work. We sometimes sing a hymn which includes this verse:

He is breaking down the barriers, He is casting up  
the way;  
He is calling for His angels to build up the gates  
of day;  
But His angels here are human, not the shining  
hosts above;

For the drum beats of His army are the heart  
beats of our love.

'He is calling for His angels . . .', calling you to be His messenger. He wants you to live for Him at school and at home. He doesn't want a sleeping angel but one who is active, eager and willing to go where He sends and obey His commands. He wants you to say what Isaiah said to Him in the Temple long ago—'Here am I, send me'. Then you will be His angel, His messenger on earth, and one of a great company of His servants who serve Him throughout the world.

#### Seeking to Save

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, V.R.D., B.D.,  
TH.M., GLASGOW

'God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.'—Jn 3<sup>17</sup>.

Does the same thing happen in your house on a Sunday morning before church as happens in ours? The air is filled with cries of 'Mummy, where's my coat?' 'Mummy, where's my Bible?' 'Mummy, where are my gloves?' If you do behave like that your mother probably says to you what mothers have been saying for a long time, 'Don't just shout, look for your things yourselves'. The other day I met a man whose whole life has been spent looking for something he didn't want to find—and he never found it. It was a man I met in a train and that was what he told me when I asked him what his work was—looking for something he didn't want to find. There's a conundrum for you. I couldn't guess what he was and finally he took pity on me and told me that he was a fireman in a coal mine. His job for forty years had been to search for the deadly fire-damp which spells disaster and death to miners. All his life he had searched and searched. Naturally, he hadn't wanted to find such a thing and he had been fortunate enough to be in a mine where none had ever appeared.

He made me think of all sorts of other useful people who look very diligently for things they don't want to find. When the doctor listens to your heart or lungs, he is hoping that he will find nothing unusual. When the policeman walks his beat, he doesn't really want to find a burglar—unless there happens to be one there. A life-guard on the beach is employed to rescue people from drowning, but if nobody gets into difficulties he is all the better pleased.



I think that lots of people have the wrong idea about Christ. He is always seeking us to find us. Many people seem to think that He is trying to catch us out, to deprive us of some good thing or to condemn us for doing some bad thing. That is just not so. St. John tells us here why Christ came into the world long ago and why He still comes to us. 'God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.'

## The Christian Year

### SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT

#### An Invitation to a Hard Life

BY THE REVEREND JAMES MARTIN, B.D., GLASGOW

'Come, take up the cross, and follow me.'—Mk 10<sup>21</sup>.

Jesus invites us to life at its best, but we must not imagine that the Christian life is one of ease and painlessness. For, as Lent reminds us, it is no primrose path He calls us to tread. His invitation is laced with challenge, challenge to adventure and the willingness to sacrifice, something of the same nature as that challenge which Garibaldi flung to his would-be followers. When Garibaldi was embarking on his crusade to liberate Italy, this was the recruiting speech he made, 'I offer neither quarters nor provisions nor wages. I offer hunger, thirst, forced marches, battles, death. Only those who love their country with their hearts and not with their lips only should follow me.' Jesus speaks in similar terms to all who think of throwing in their lot with Him. 'I offer no ease, no luxury nor material benefits. I offer hardship and self-sacrifice. I offer a cross. Only those who are prepared to love Me with their hearts and not their lips only should follow Me.'

Some may feel that to emphasize this is to weaken our prospects of effective evangelism. To talk so much of the hardness of the Christian life will repel rather than attract those who hear. But will it? The very difficulty of a task often carries its own appeal. Think of Garibaldi! He got his recruits. Think of Churchill and his clarion call to blood and sweat and toil and tears! That did not frighten, it inspired. Think of Scott's last expedition to the Antarctic and its many privations! Eight thousand volunteers offered to accompany him.

In the hearts of most there smoulders a fire of gallantry which will blaze into full flame when the wind of some particular call to adventure sweeps across it. In every generation Jesus has found this true, and has encountered men and women, boys and girls, willing to give themselves over to the high adventure of His service.

It must be admitted, of course, that there have been, too, in every age some whose hearts have proved too faint at the thought of the cost and who have decided they could not face it. What of us? Is there such gallantry in our soul as sets it all a quiver under the impact of Christ's challenge so that we must up and follow Him? Or do we, like the Rich Young Ruler, count it too foolhardy an enterprise? If, indeed, it is an easy life we desire we need not look for it in Jesus. But if, on the other hand, we can see bigger horizons than that, then Jesus is the Leader we want.

It is worth remembering, too, that the hardness of the Christian life is closely associated with its joy. When we think of men engaged on hazardous exploits like those of Scott's last expedition or those assaulting Mount Everest or Livingstone in the heart of Africa we sometimes think, too, do we not, 'These men know what real life is'. And in the high adventure to which Christ calls us real life is to be found.

Every one desires happiness and it is natural that we should. But let us not make the mistake of imagining that the happiest life is that in which there is neither struggle nor sacrifice. What real enjoyment is there in taking the field against weak opposition and trouncing them soundly without having to exert ourselves? There is no thrill to be had from a game like that. It is when the game asks everything we have that we enjoy it most. And with life, it is the strenuous game that Jesus invites us to play for Him which gives most happiness. And this not in spite of the struggle and the stress and the hard unrelenting effort it demands but partly because of it.

If we should be timid, if we should prefer to keep our feet firm on the solid earth of self-interest and common-sense and refuse to venture recklessly forth upon the sea of Christ's service, we will find life a much easier thing in many ways but we will miss a great deal that is well worth having. That sea will often be rough, sometimes stormy, but the man who sails it will have life at its best. Dick Sheppard put it this way. 'The one thing we need to learn, if life is to be glorious and Christ-like, is the sound of trumpets in the morning, calling us to let the hero within us get the better of the coward. There is nothing in life so worthwhile as to ride out in happy valiancy with Christ.'

Moreover, the gladness which comes from flinging oneself whole-heartedly into the Christian adventure is no mere hollow imitation. It is no melody in a minor key, no forced cheerfulness, no pale pretence. It is the real thing. It is not a case of carrying our daily cross with a pseudo-cheerful resignation but, as Samuel Rutherford has it, of finding that cross to be 'such a burden as wings are to a bird, or sails to a boat'.



It is real joy that we experience when we follow the Christian way, hard and costly though that way often is. And the chief reason is that Jesus travels with us. If a man should attempt the Christian way in the manner of some formal adherence to a code, in all probability it will be for him a dreary journey. But if he should tackle that road with the passionate desire to follow it for Jesus' sake and with real awareness that Jesus is beside him, how different things become. Jesus' demands are still as exacting, the road still as difficult, the adventure still as costly. But because it is service rendered for love and because Jesus is with him, the hardship is as nothing and life becomes magnificently rich.

This Lenten theme is summed up in these lines which tell how a soul, fearful at first of the cost but at last deciding to risk it, finds the joy of obedience to Christ.

I said, 'Let me walk in the fields';  
He said, 'Nay, walk in the town'.  
I said, 'There are no flowers there';  
He said, 'No flowers, but a crown'.  
  
I said, 'But the sky is black,  
There is nothing but noise and din'.  
But He wept as He sent me back,  
'There is more', He said, 'There is sin'.  
  
I said, 'But the air is thick,  
And fogs are veiling the sun'.  
He answered, 'Yet hearts are sick,  
And souls in the dark undone'.  
  
I said, 'I shall miss the light,  
And friends will miss me, they say'.  
He answered me, 'Choose to-night  
If I am to miss you, or they'.  
  
I cast one look at the fields,  
Then set my face to the town.  
He said, 'My child, do you yield?  
Will you leave the flowers for the crown?'  
  
Then into His hand went mine,  
And into my heart came He,  
And I walked in a light divine  
The path that I feared to see.

### THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT

#### The Price and the Cost

BY THE REVEREND JAMES WRIGHT, D.D.,  
STEWARTON

'Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence?'—Jn 12<sup>5</sup>.

Judas was the kind of man who knew the price of everything—a most useful gift in certain circumstances. It was perhaps because he had that gift

that he was chosen to be the treasurer of the Apostolic band. He would have to do the shopping in an Eastern market where the seller was sure to begin with to ask more for his goods than they were worth and than he expected to get. Judas was equal to such a situation and could be depended on to see to it that he got fair value for his money.

But there are circumstances where the exercise of this gift is outrageously out of place, and we are concerned with one of these. When Judas saw the woman produce her alabaster vase of perfume, his mind at once set about calculating what it would fetch, three hundred pence, and when he saw her pour out the precious contents over the feet of Jesus thence to run off mingled with her tears on to the floor, he muttered 'What criminal waste!' His very thinking of the price then makes him appear in such a scene as sinister, indeed a diabolic figure.

Later his habit of price fixing was to lead him to deeper depths—indeed to the uttermost depths of infamy. He realized that the Master had money value in a certain market, and would fetch a price from His enemies, and he went to them and covenanted with them to betray his Master into their hands for thirty pieces of silver. Maybe they agreed without demur to give Judas what he asked. Maybe they haggled with Judas for a space before the bargain was concluded. The scenes in the slave market where human beings were sold and bought for money are among the most shameful in human history, but Judas' selling of Jesus to death eclipses even these.

How different was the attitude of the woman, the heroine in our story. She never thought of the price the vase of perfume would fetch. Her one thought was of the cost to Jesus of His friendship to her. If, as is reasonable to conjecture, this is the Johannine version of the similar story in St. Luke's Gospel, this is the woman that had been a sinner and by befriending her Jesus had lifted her out of degradation and defilement, but she well knew that such action would bring upon Him the implacable hatred of the powerful in the land. To them this and similar actions on His part were an outrage on morality and decency and the perpetrator of them must be put out of action. Perhaps Mary was aware—as Jesus was—that she was anointing His body for His burial and that it was for her sake, and her like, that His life was to be sacrificed. The thought of that cost to Him was what impelled her to this beautiful act of grief and gratitude.

Let us reflect then on the difference, the world of difference, between the price of various things and their cost; and first in the context of our *Civil rights*: of our say in the country's affairs, of



our vote. The price of that to us is precisely nothing. We don't even have to pay taxes to get it, but only to have reached a certain age. Its cost, though, to others—to discover the total amount of that, if it were calculable at all would take us travelling back all the long way of our country's history; but let us content ourselves with travelling no farther back than the last War, fresh as it is in the memory of most. Had that War not been fought and won, our vote would have been worth nothing. We could have used it to support a nominee of the Nazi party, and if we had refused, it would have meant for us rotting in a concentration camp or perishing in a gas chamber. The price of our vote to us is nil but its cost to others in years of exile from home, in the horrors of imprisonment, in wounds and maiming, in death and sorrows, is beyond all computing. Let us reflect on that and something akin to the gratitude of the woman with her vase will burn in our hearts and make it impossible for us to use our vote for selfish ends—and impel us to make the cross on our ballot paper—mark you the cross—a means towards a better country, a better world, a fairer future.

Think now of the difference between the price and the cost in the context of *the Church's ministrations*. The Church meets us at all the thresholds of our human life with the offer of the grace which is sufficient. When our babies arrive on the scene, it pledges to us and to them in baptism the divine help for all their journey. When we are setting up our homes, it proffers to us in the marriage service the aid of Him who can sanctify all the experiences and testings which lie ahead; and when loved ones cross the threshold of death, it speaks comfortingly to us of the new life of which death is the gateway. And the price of these unspeakable benefits to us is nothing. I have known ministers, exasperated by people who demand the service of the Church and do little or nothing for the Church's support, advocating that a charge be levied on such people on these occasions. But that would put back the hands of the clock beyond the time of the Reformation, four hundred years back. The Reformation made a clean sweep of the scale of charges, exacted by the Roman Church, made an end of such an outrage as the refusal of Christian burial where the relatives could not pay the prescribed fee. It cleansed the Temple of the money-changers and we must not under any provocation reinstate them.

But though the Church exacts no price, do not let us forget that the survival of the Church has cost the utter self-giving of the martyrs, the sufferings and sacrifices of our forefathers. With these on our minds and consciences, we cannot but be

moved by thankfulness to feel that it is our privilege in our day to secure by our sacrifices the survival of the Church and its adequacy for its tasks—and feel that such sacrifices are no hardship but the least we can do.

And let us think of yet another difference between the price and the cost—and this the most vital of all—I write now of *our salvation*. It is a free salvation—'without money and without price'—and the benefits which it confers include no less than the pardon of our sins, renewal by the Holy Spirit and everlasting life. We are not asked to pay for these, indeed those who think of paying for them disqualify themselves from receiving them. Neither with our good works nor with good money, nor with the promise of future payment in any form can we purchase them. But the cost of them to our Saviour, that is beyond all computation—it passes understanding. His agony in Gethsemane, His sufferings on Calvary, we cannot plumb their depths.

We may not know, we cannot tell  
What pains He had to bear.

They are like Matthew Arnold's lofty mountain which 'spares but the cloudy border of its base to the foiled searching of mortality'. But to contemplate them, even thus, is to be moved as nothing else can move the soul of man and to experience that revolution we call conversion. It forces from us the confession 'we are not our own, we are bought with a price'. It puts this song in our heart and on our lips:

Were the whole realm of Nature mine,  
That were an offering far too small;  
Love so amazing, so divine,  
Demands my soul, my life, my all.

#### FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT

##### Solomon the Pompous<sup>1</sup>

If a little man becomes a leader, and sometimes little men do become leaders, they bamboozle you. They bamboozle you so that they may appear giant size. Remember how Jesus demolished Solomon's grandeur in one revealing sentence. Holding a wild flower in his hand, he said, 'Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these'. But he's built up, of course, even in the Bible.

But who was this Solomon? He was the son of David and Bathsheba; not conceived out of wedlock, but in wedlock, for David married

<sup>1</sup> D. W. Cleverley Ford, *An Expository Preacher's Notebook*, 97 ff. This is quoted by kind permission of the publishers. The volume is reviewed under 'Literature'.



Bathsheba after the death of their illegitimate child and Uriah's death. The name Solomon means 'peaceful', and his alternative name, Jedidah, means 'Beloved of Yah'. The text, 2 Samuel 12<sup>24</sup>, roundly says, 'And the Lord loved him'. This at least cannot be denied. The Lord loves all His children, even those born of unions like David and Bathsheba's. But perhaps the phrase meant more. Perhaps it means 'Where sin did abound, grace did much more abound' (Romans 5<sup>20</sup>).

We ought to examine in 1 Kings, chapters 1 and 2, the beginning of Solomon's reign. He was made king in a hurry. In the midst of all the passion and intrigue, it is difficult to see what qualification Solomon had for leadership. He was erected on his plinth by those who saw in him the means to preserve 'the status quo'. All was set therefore for the office of king to be magnified.

Now Solomon wanted power. It must be admitted that Solomon needed power. To retain a throne that has been seized in the face of rivals who possess a claim to the throne calls for the possession of power.

*Knowledge is power. Solomon must therefore obtain a reputation for wisdom.* It would establish him in his kingdom. No one respects learning so much as those who lack it. The people must therefore come to count their King as one of superior wisdom. For wisdom Solomon prayed at Gibeon (1 K 3<sup>9</sup>). We need to note this prayer. Nothing so reveals a man as what he prays for, and in this prayer Solomon did not pray 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do' but 'Lord, what wilt thou give me that I may govern this people'. This is equivalent to seeking God's help for what is intended already. It is praying which leaves man at the centre and God on the circumference. It is not true prayer. It is not communion with God, though this is not to say God never answers such prayers. Sometimes He does and withal sends leanness into the soul. It is a window on Solomon.

Solomon gained his reputation for wisdom, and a sample is given in 1 K 3<sup>16</sup>.

A near modern parallel to this cleverness (as opposed to wisdom) of Solomon belongs to the late Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany. Knowing that he would meet at a banquet leading statesmen of Britain, he would labour beforehand at learning from an encyclopaedia lists of facts concerning Britain. At dinner he would select some leading but all-unsuspecting statesman and 'fire off' his string of innocent questions—What was the size and tonnage of certain ships of the British fleet? What was the constitution of the London County Council? And so forth. As likely as not the unprepared statesman would flounder, whereupon the Kaiser would suggest the correct information he

had already learnt, thereby giving an impression of great wisdom possessed by his Imperial Majesty the Kaiser of Germany. It used to succeed.

Solomon's reputation is described in 1 K 4<sup>30</sup> as follows: 'And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the East, and all the wisdom of Egypt. . . . And he spake three thousand proverbs and his songs were a thousand and five. . . .'

We shall be pardoned, I think, if we remark that one thousand and five songs is a large number for one man to compose, and three thousand proverbs is exceedingly large. Perhaps we are to read this as we read of Solomon building the Temple; he did not build it with his own hands, he ordered the building. Perhaps he also ordered groups of musicians and groups of 'wise men' gathered in his court to compose these songs and proverbs. They were royal command works—at least they were Solomon's in this sense.

Here it must be said that God-like leadership never seeks to dazzle the led. It was the temptation Jesus refused on the pinnacle of the temple (Matt 4<sup>6</sup>). He would not cast himself down and walk away unhurt. Such action would leave the beholders little choice but to follow him, but such following is scarcely free. It would be the outcome of an assault on the normal rational process. The truth is, the truly great leader does not need to compel people to follow him, and those who resort to all forms of 'build-up' and compulsion only advertise the underlying littleness of their own stature. Such was Solomon.

*A second device adopted by Solomon to dominate was his magnificent building programme.* Leadership which produces buildings has something to show for itself. Buildings advertise. And in Church life the spiritual advance of a congregation is not so obvious, nor so permanent a memorial to a Vicar's leadership as a new Church Hall. New buildings need not be thus interpreted, but there is a leadership which is not strong in itself yet seeks to pass as strong and uses a showy building programme to accomplish it. Such was Solomon's.

This is not to underrate the impressiveness of his building achievement. His work meant the transformation of the very landscape at Jerusalem. Mount Moriah needed levelling and huge retaining walls constructed in order to effect a plain sufficiently flat to serve as a foundation. Then the intervening space between Mount Moriah and Jebus had to be filled in. When this was completed three buildings were erected; first, the house of the forest of Lebanon, next, the king's own house, and finally, the Temple surrounded by its court. All these buildings were constructed of hewn stone and cedar wood. According to modern standards, they were not large, the greatest of



them being only 150 feet long, 75 feet broad and 45 feet high; but the expensive materials used and the costly furnishings, including much gold overlay, represented enormous expense. And all this must be set against a background of village life, which was all that Israel had seen of civilized life hitherto within its borders. Truly it was a brilliant stage which Solomon had erected in the centre of his kingdom, and no doubt the people were dazzled.

Now we look at the reverse side of the picture. Like all excessive building in the ancient world it rested on a basis of slave labour. Jerusalem must have provided a sorry sight from the human angle. Always and everywhere, gangs of men and yet more gangs, cursing, sweating, dying, and always the taskmaster ready with whip and rod. If the Hebrew levies bled, how the Canaanite levies must have bled! And every drop of blood squeezed so that Solomon's God might dwell in a house of Solomon's building, and Solomon himself, his wives and his government dwell in dazzling magnificence. Surely if any buildings were cursed, these (so elaborately described in six chapters of the First Book of Kings) must have been cursed as no other buildings since the days of the erection of the pyramids. And the root cause of all this pile of human misery was Solomon's desire to build a house for God's glory—or was it a house for God for Solomon's glory.

There is something wrong at the root with a religion which does not 'do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with its god' (Micah 6<sup>8</sup>). And who knows if Micah and all the prophets did not read this lesson first in reading of King Solomon. Genuine religion and social injustice can never march together. Neither, of course, is social justice a substitute for religion. Perhaps this is a lesson that needs to be learned in mid-twentieth-century England. But of all religious men who grind down the underdog, Solomon is the father. The practical safeguard for the rich is tenderheartedness and generosity. These for their own soul's sake they should cultivate. But Solomon jeopardized his soul when in his prosperity he became cruel.

To live the godly life amidst wealth and power is not easier than amidst poverty and lowliness, but it is no less necessary. It needs both grace and capacity to achieve it. Unfortunately Solomon lacked both. That was his tragedy. A little man set on a big stage. A round peg in a square hole. And he cut the hole himself and lined it all with gold.

Can you blame Solomon? What shall a man do who finds himself in the seat of greatness but lacks true greatness in himself? He should

accept himself. He should not pad himself and puff himself. He should seek a reputation for largeheartedness and kindness; men will forgive him much if he shows these virtues. And the irony of the situation is that Solomon did begin that way. To Adonijah and Shimei he displayed a commendable clemency. Then he began to strut. But how hardly shall they that strut enter into the kingdom of God. Even their crackling robes look mean and tawdry, or, as Jesus remarked, holding in his hand a flower of the field: 'Even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these'.

#### PASSION SUNDAY

#### Our Response to the Cross

BY THE REVEREND ERIK ROUTLEY, B.D., D. PHIL.,  
EDINBURGH

'Who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.'—Heb 12<sup>2</sup>.

Not 'who for the *duty* that was set before Him', but 'who for the *joy* that was set before him'—so writes the author of Hebrews concerning our Lord's Passion. He has just been writing of the men and women of faith who have been the architects of Israel's religion. By all these—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses and the rest, not excluding Rahab—the house of faith has been built up. They lived in a faith which was also hope. They trusted the Promises, though they did not receive their full fruit. In Jesus Christ we have received this 'better thing', in that we have seen acted out before our eyes the faith and hope in which, not seeing, all these others believed.

And now, he goes on, men and women who must live out their daily lives in the Church (in a persecuted, despised Church, a Church where there seemed to be very little hope of a practical future) may look to Jesus, in whom their faith begins and ends; in Jesus all the ground of faith and all the fulfilment of hope is publicly displayed. And it is displayed *in that* He endured the Cross, making light of the shame, 'for the *joy* that was set before him'.

This text contains a precept which Christians normally disobey, and a truth which we find it convenient usually to disregard. We may test that assertion by asking, What do we regard as the proper response to the events of the Passion?

There are two attitudes to the Passion which are common, conventional and in direct contradiction to the gospel.

The first is that of *pity*. Our imaginations take us to the scene of Golgotha, to the darkness of



Gethsemane, and we say to ourselves, 'How dreadful that this should happen!' We concentrate on the suffering, and get no further. Our minds become helpless to take us further. Here is a Man undeservedly suffering. What can we do? This attitude of paralysis is encouraged by a number of the hymns we sing, and by certain very popular but theologically reprehensible Passiontide cantatas. This response to the Passion is, of course, directly reprehended in our Lord's words. 'Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me'; but although the hymn,

Weep not for Him who onward bears  
His Cross to Calvary,

is constructed out of that text, it remains a good example of how not to sing of the Passion; although it urges us not to pity the Saviour for His physical sufferings, it does invite us to pity Him for His mental sufferings. 'Have we no tears to shed for Him?' is a line in 'O come and mourn' which has the same effect. The somewhat indiscriminate use of the phrase 'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?' is of the same kind. Pity is not what our Lord asks of us.

But (secondly), pity can have one outlet, which not infrequently it finds. It can lead to *wrath* against those who historically were responsible for the Lord's crucifixion. 'That people could be so cruel! It is intolerable!' Old-fashioned hymns which are not now sung contain lines like 'He whom bad men crucified'—a preposterous denial of what we read in Scripture. The tragedy was that many of them were very good men. But what really matters to Christians is to note that this is all that a man can say about the Cross if he does not hold the Christian doctrine of Christ's divinity and Christ's resurrection. A fine book recently published by Kamel Hussein, entitled, *City of Wrong*, exposed this fault admirably. Its author is not a Christian but a devout holder of the faith of Islam. He has no doctrine of Christ's Resurrection or of His Divinity. Therefore he can only see the whole affair as a monstrous miscarriage of justice. His book ably analyses what may have been the motives of Caiaphas and his friends; but its basic assumption is that 'this was a wicked thing to do'. It was, in a sense; but what we have to reckon with is that Jesus Christ would undoubtedly have said, at every point in it, that this was the *right thing to happen*. 'Not as I will, but as thou wilt.' Therefore the man who would be in Christ must not let himself be preoccupied with thoughts that Jesus did not Himself entertain.

We might say to ourselves, 'Had I been there, I would have dissented from the Sanhedrin's vote. Had I been there I should not have joined in the shout of "Crucify!" Had I been there, I should

have stood and fought in the garden.' Can any of us be sure? To which of us, supposing us to be patriotic and fair-minded people, would the Sanhedrin's decision have appeared wrong? Which of us could have stood aside from the crowd? Was not Peter's sword drawn against Malchus in common justice and decent courage? But no—'They that take the sword shall perish by the sword'.

The great judgment of the Passion on us is expressed not through concentrating on the ghastly details of the Crucifixion (though they were ghastly) or on a high-minded condemnation of those who ordered it and schemed to get it (though they were walking in darkness). Judge not. Leave God to judge. He has judged. There is no more for us to do there.

No—the judgment of the Passion on us is on our *reluctance to receive the joy*. Test this, by considering what is your reaction to the carol, 'Tomorrow shall be my dancing day'. Or consider for what reasons 'The royal banners forward go' is neglected by many hymn-book editors (including those of the Church of Scotland). Consider what it could possibly mean to 'rejoice in the Passion'.

Can we do this? Why do we not do it? We are reluctant to do it because we are still sure that Jesus wants our pity, and our censure of our fellow-men more than He wants our glad acceptance of what He has done for us. Reverence seems to demand a melancholy demeanour at Passiontide. 'Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?' There is no trace from end to end of any of the four Passion stories of any demand on our Lord's part that we should be sorrowful. There is no trace in any of the Apostle's comments on the Cross of any injunction that we should use Passiontide as an occasion for reminding ourselves about the *duties* and *demands* of what we call our faith. There is every ground in both authorities for insisting that this is the time, of all times, when we should rejoice; when we should learn that joy comes through penitence, but that penitence which produces no joy is not penitence but despair. So much of our response to the Cross is legalistic, earth-bound, duty-ridden. It must not be so. Here is the season when we can understand what Luther's *sola fide* meant. No time, this, for counting our merits and dignifying them by calling them sacrifices. All we may do is look with awe at what the love of God has done, accept what it has given, and forget ourselves altogether.

Here his whole name appears complete,

Nor wit can guess, nor reason prove  
Which of the letters best is writ

The power, the wisdom, or the love!



## Contributions and Comments

### Spirit or Finger

'But if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you' (Mt 12<sup>28</sup>).

'But if I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you' (Lk 11<sup>20</sup>).

It is frequently asserted that the original Q saying underlying these two verses was in the Lukan form. The reasons for this are usually presented as: (1) Luke had a strong interest in the Spirit and would not have left it out had it been in Q as he read it. (2) Matthew changed 'finger' to 'Spirit' partly to prepare for the subsequent references to the Spirit in his collection of sayings, and partly to avoid an anthropomorphism. In this note it is suggested that this rests on too superficial an acceptance of Luke's interest in the Spirit, and does not accord with the evidence in the Synoptic Gospels with regard to their attitude to the Spirit.

As a preliminary to a close study of the relevant passages we may note that Luke is said to have rather more references to the Spirit than Matthew. This is true if we include the birth narratives (Luke seventeen references—perhaps nineteen—Matthew twelve), but it may be questioned whether this is a true comparison. We have no means of checking what was the attitude of Luke's source in the infancy narratives to the Holy Spirit. Moreover, we certainly should not allow the many references to the Spirit in Acts to bias our judgment, for Luke may believe that everything in the Early Church was directed by the Spirit and yet give an accurate account of his sources in the Gospel. Indeed his special interest in the Spirit in the life of the Church brings into relief the way in which he in fact refers to the Spirit in his earlier writing. If the infancy narratives are left out of account we find that both Luke and Matthew have ten references to the Spirit.

(A) A first step should be to examine the six Markan references to the Spirit and compare the ways in which Luke and Matthew treat these.

Three may be dismissed speedily, for in these the two later Evangelists retain the mention of the Spirit. Mk 1<sup>8</sup>=Mt 3<sup>11</sup>=Lk 3<sup>16</sup> 'he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost', Mk 1<sup>10</sup>=Mt 3<sup>16</sup>=Lk 3<sup>22</sup> 'the Spirit as a dove descending' (Luke changes to Holy Spirit), Mk 1<sup>12</sup>=Mt 4<sup>1</sup>=Lk 4<sup>1</sup> Jesus is led by the Spirit into the wilderness.

In one Luke removes the Markan reference to the Spirit, while Matthew retains (Mk 12<sup>36</sup>=Mt 22<sup>43</sup>=Lk 20<sup>42</sup> 'David himself said in the Holy Spirit'). This can hardly be because he does not believe that the Spirit inspired the writers of the

Old Testament (cf. Ac 1<sup>16</sup>), and the precise reference to the David quotation could easily have been combined with the Spirit reference.

The other two texts call for more detailed discussion since there is no straightforward borrowing.

The blasphemy saying seems to have been included in both Mark and Q, since Matthew gives a doublet of the saying (Mt 12<sup>31</sup> and <sup>32</sup>). Luke has but one saying which seems to be in the main from Q, though many say it has been influenced by the Markan version (Lk 12<sup>10</sup>). We note that Matthew includes *both* sayings, Luke combines (?) into one.

The promise of the Spirit by Jesus in Mk 13<sup>11</sup> presents even greater difficulties. Neither Matthew nor Luke include it in its Markan context (cf. Mt 24 and Lk 21), although they have the saying elsewhere, and it may have existed in a Q variant. The methods of both writers are significant. Matthew lacks the saying in ch. 24 because he has included a section of the material from Mk 13 in ch. 10, and the saying is found in 10<sup>20</sup>. Luke on the other hand has most of the Markan material (with various modifications) in ch. 21, but for this verse seems deliberately to have preferred a variant 'For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to withstand or to gainsay' (Lk 21<sup>15</sup>). He does, however, include the Markan saying in Lk 12<sup>12</sup>, and it may be that here he conflates Mark and Q as he did with the previous saying.

Thus on the evidence from the Markan parallels we find that Matthew includes all six of the sayings, on the whole in the context of their surrounding material, and once includes both the Markan and the Q forms of the saying. Luke on the other hand removes one reference to the Spirit and on two other occasions either conflates with Q or prefers Q, or transfers the saying to a different context.

To this should be added the places where the later Evangelists add mention of the Spirit to Markan contexts. Matthew never does this. Luke inserts references to the Spirit in 4<sup>1</sup> (=Mk 1<sup>12</sup>) and 4<sup>14</sup> (=Mk 1<sup>14</sup>), but it must be noticed that he does not do this in sayings of Jesus, and that he is in effect only making more explicit what is implied in the Markan narrative.

(B) From this we may turn to the references peculiar to Matthew or Luke. Matthew has two of these: 12<sup>18</sup>, a quotation of Is 42 in which the reference to the Spirit is incidental to the main purpose of the quotation, and the Trinitarian baptismal formula in 28<sup>19</sup>. In neither is the Spirit mentioned for its own sake. Luke has the Spirit in Jesus' quotation of Is 61 (Lk 4<sup>18</sup>), and while he



no doubt places some emphasis on the Spirit here by his transferring of the preaching in Nazareth to the beginning of Jesus' ministry he brings this into close contiguity with the baptism. None of these verses is significant, therefore.

(C) It is now possible to approach the remaining sayings, all from Q.

Mt 10<sup>20</sup>=Lk 12<sup>12</sup> and Mt 12<sup>32</sup>=Lk 12<sup>10</sup> have been considered above in connexion with the similar Markan sayings.

In Lk 10<sup>21</sup>=Mt 11<sup>25</sup> Luke seems to have added the statement that Jesus uttered this mysterious saying 'in the Holy Spirit' to the more original Matthean form of the saying. This is somewhat similar to his two additions to Markan contexts, being his interpretation of prophetic utterance.

Lk 11<sup>13</sup>=Mt 7<sup>11</sup> 'how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?' is more probably direct alteration of the original saying—possibly due to his belief that the promise referred to God's gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. It is the only saying of Jesus where he does this.

(D) Thus so far it may be asserted that the evidence shows that Matthew keeps close to his sources and *never* in the passages examined *adds* references to the Holy Spirit. On the other hand Luke both adds such references, *and deletes them*. It is therefore to be assumed that the same applied to the 'finger' passage under discussion, and the two arguments advanced for the Matthean alteration here are hardly sufficient to overturn this conclusion. Matthew may well have found an added incentive for conflating Mark and Q here because they both had a reference to the Spirit. Certainly he had no special aversion to anthropomorphic expressions, for he can include that saying in which Jesus refers to the earth as the

footstool of God's feet (Mt 5<sup>34f.</sup>), and says that God 'sees' the secret pious acts, anthropomorphisms not found in the other Gospels. Moreover his 'Spirit of God' looks 'primitive', while the phrase 'Kingdom of God' (not 'of heaven') is found here, suggesting that he is keeping close to his source.

Two questions remain: how did the Lukan form of the saying arise, and which form represents the original saying of Jesus? The answer to the first may be that Luke had the saying in this form in his L material, though the very close verbal similarities with Matthew might be thought to tell against this. However, the saying is in a brief, almost proverbial form, and may have existed in two recensions which differed only in the word 'Spirit' or 'finger'. If this is thought unlikely, we are driven back on the assumption that he deliberately altered his source as he did in 21<sup>15</sup>, introducing an Old Testament phrase.

This does not prove that the Matthean form of the saying represents the original words of Jesus, but suggests only that we are not in a position to assert that the original Q saying had 'finger of God'. A Q saying might have been altered at some time from the exact words of Jesus, either to remove an anthropomorphism, or under the influence of the belief that the power of Jesus over the demons came from His being possessed by the Spirit. And since 'finger of God' occurs only here in the New Testament and is rare in the Old it may be that the variant form of the saying which Luke knew comes nearer to the originality of the mind of Jesus. Certainly, however, the authenticity of the Spirit here cannot be so lightly dismissed as has often been done in the past.

C. S. RODD

Handsworth College,  
Birmingham

## Recent Foreign Theology

**The Message of Jesus Then and Now.** Professor Ethelbert Stauffer, whose name is almost as well known in this country as in his own, has written a small book that is packed with good things under the title *The Message of Jesus Then and Now*.<sup>1</sup> The opening chapter, which occupies but four pages, is on Jesus and the Qumran movement. So much has been written to suggest that Jesus and the Church owed almost everything to the Qumran community that it is refreshing to find Dr. Stauffer maintaining that there is an almost complete contrast between the teaching of Jesus and that of the Qumran sectaries. He lists no less

<sup>1</sup> *Die Botschaft Jesu damals und heute*. Dap Taschenbücher [1959]. Francke Verlag, Bern; Swiss Fr. 3.80.

than twenty-two sharp contrasts between the ideas of the sect and the teaching of Jesus, and goes on to say that the influence of Qumran was felt in the Church and appears in the later elements of the New Testament. The anti-Qumran elements of the Gospels go back to Jesus, therefore, and the philo-Qumran elements to the Church. Then Professor Stauffer proceeds to examine the teaching of Jesus in the field of human conduct under its main headings, with innumerable references to history, both ancient and modern. With moving eloquence he indicts those who have exalted obedience to orders above moral considerations, including those who committed crimes against humanity in the name of obedience to Nazi



orders. Equally movingly he writes of the ties that bind nations together, despite all wars and propaganda, and of the debt of Germany to Britain, America, China, France, and Russia. The book throughout is contemporary in its emphasis and New Testament in its inspiration, and every page will richly reward its reader.

**The Kingdom of God and its Coming.** In 1937 the Strasbourg Professor, J. Héring, published an important volume, under the title *The Kingdom of God and its Coming*, with the sub-title *A Study of the Expectation of Jesus and of the Apostle Paul*.<sup>1</sup> This was reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES by the late Dr. A. E. Garvie.<sup>2</sup> Professor Héring argued that Jesus rejected the title of Messiah, but believed in His own future identity with the Heavenly Man of Daniel and Enoch, who was destined to appear on the clouds of heaven. This expectation was transformed by the primitive Christian community, and later Mark messianized the earthly life of Jesus and attributed to Him the Messianic secret. Paul adopted both ideas, and developed the idea of a heavenly pre-existent Being who was incarnated in Jesus, while at the same time taking over the idea of a Messianic kingdom. Professor Héring's book, which has long been out of print, has now been reprinted and published by a different publisher,<sup>3</sup> with a single page of Addenda to the text and four short appendices. These deal with the Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel, the Suffering Servant in the Gospels, the Messiah in the Qumran texts, and some recent works dealing with the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. Much more could be said on Qumran Messianism than can be said in the two pages here devoted to it, and similarly the brief notes on the views of Lohmeyer, Bultmann, Stauffer and Cullmann, given in the final appendix, could be much expanded. It is for the reprint of the text of Héring's long inaccessible work that this volume is most to be welcomed, and many will be glad to have access to it—and not least those who will not readily accept its theses.

<sup>1</sup> *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue : étude sur l'espérance de Jésus et de l'apôtre Paul*. Alcan, Paris.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. xlix. [1937–38] 425f.

<sup>3</sup> In the series Bibliothèque Théologique [1959]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel; Swiss Fr. 12.50.

**Introduction to the Bible.** The Old Testament volume of the Introduction to the Bible, edited by the late A. Robert and A. Feuillet has already been noted in these columns<sup>4</sup>. Now the New Testament volume has appeared.<sup>5</sup> Like its predecessor, it contains more than is normally included in English Introductions. There are chapters on the Græco-Roman world, and on the Jewish world, as well as on the intertestamental literature and rabbinical writings, before the literature of the New Testament itself is treated. There are brief sections on the Qumran sect and its literature (from the pen of J. Carmignac). The Synoptic Gospels are dealt with by X. Léon-Dufour in nearly two hundred pages, Acts and the Pauline Corpus by L. Cerfaux and J. Cambier in a further two hundred pages, with an additional chapter on Hebrews, which is regarded as not from the hand of Paul but dependent on Paul's teaching. J. Cantinat is responsible for the chapter on the Catholic Epistles, and A. Feuillet and M. E. Boismard for that on the Johannine writings. The view that the Fourth Gospel was written in Aramaic is rejected, but Boismard's view that parts may have been is quoted without disapproval. There is a brief section on the links between the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The late J. Bonsirven and C. Bigaré contribute a short chapter on New Testament Apocrypha, and this is followed by a chapter by Feuillet and S. Lyonnet, again running to nearly two hundred pages, on the major theological ideas of the New Testament. While the work is often cautious, with an eye on the decrees of the Biblical Commission, it is throughout scholarly and balanced, and its readers are introduced to the views on New Testament problems propounded by scholars of every hue. On Form-Criticism the views of Vincent Taylor are quoted with approval as a good example of the constructive sifting of the wheat from the tares. That there is no section on the Canon of the New Testament, or on the Text and Versions, is, perhaps, surprising.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester

<sup>4</sup> THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxi. [1957–58] 254 f.

<sup>5</sup> *Introduction à la Bible : II. Nouveau Testament* [1959]. Desclée, Tournai and Paris; French Fr. 31.50.

## Entre Nous

### The Blood of the Martyrs the Seed of the Church

Fifty-four years old is a fair age for a book. *Persecution in the Early Church*, by the late Herbert

B. Workman, was first published in 1906. It now appears as a 'Wyvern Book' (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). We greet this book with enthusiasm and with gratitude, because it still



remains far and away the best and the most thrilling account of the sufferings and the triumphs of the Early Church.

There is a first-class chapter on 'The Causes of Hatred', in which the reasons why the Early Church was persecuted are analysed. (1) The Jews were behind much of the persecution. Tertullian called them 'the sources of persecution', and since Judaism itself was a *religio licita*, a legal religion, and since the Jews were dispersed all over the world, and since their commercial genius gave them the ear of the authorities, they could and did work immense harm to the Church. (2) The superstition of the heathen caused much persecution. The old religion had ceased to be a vital force in Rome, but its observance was still 'a branch of the civil service primarily connected with the safety of the state'. To fail to observe it was to risk the disfavour of the neglected gods. Hence, as Tertullian wrote, 'If the Tiber floods the city, or the Nile refuses to rise, or the sky withholds its rain, if there is an earthquake, famine, or pestilence, at once the cry is raised: Christians to the lions'. (3) Christians were hated for the effect of Christianity on the family. 'Tampering with family relationships' was one of the earliest charges against the Christians. There were obvious difficulties if one member became a Christian and another did not. A mixed marriage between pagan and Christian ran obvious risks. And one can hardly withhold sympathy from the heathen husband who is blamed by Tertullian because he takes it ill that his wife 'for the sake of visiting the brethren goes round from street to street to other men's cottages, especially those of the poor. . . . He will not allow her to be absent all night long at nocturnal convocations and paschal solemnities . . . or suffer her to creep into prison to kiss a martyr's bonds, or even to exchange a kiss with one of the brethren.' (4) The Christian attitude to property, especially to slaves, was bound to cause trouble. In the eyes of Roman law a slave was not a person but a thing, but Lactantius said of the Christians: 'Slaves are not slaves to us. We deem them brothers after the Spirit, in religion fellow-servants.' Christianity did not emancipate the slaves, but for all that it destroyed slavery. (5) The Christian preaching which looked forward to the end of the world in flames and the destruction of their enemies did not make them popular. (6) The Christian rites were deliberately misunderstood. The Christians were accused of sexual orgies because they kept the Love Feast, the Agapē; the kiss of peace was misunderstood and could indeed be abused; the talk of eating the body and drinking the blood of Jesus Christ produced the charge of cannibalism; the bringing of a

child for baptism begot the story that the child was sacrificed. (7) The Christian was necessarily different. There were trades and professions in which he would rather starve than take part, and the world always hates the man who will not conform. (8) The greatest cause of hatred was that the Christians were regarded as politically disloyal and dangerous because they would not acknowledge the Emperor as Lord, a name which they would give to Christ and to Christ alone.

There is a thrilling chapter on 'The Experiences of the Persecuted'. They were tortured in ways which hardly bear relating, but they remained steadfast. 'Do you suppose', said the prefect Junius Rusticus to Justin and his companions, 'that you will ascend up to heaven to receive some recompense there?' 'I do not suppose', said Justin, 'for I know it and am persuaded of it.' When Carpus was nailed to the Cross he smiled. 'What made you laugh?' said his astonished executioners. 'I saw the glory of the Lord, and was glad', came the answer. Afra of Augsburg was a converted prostitute who died for her faith. 'I hear you were a prostitute', said the judge. 'Sacrifice, then, for the God of the Christians will have nothing to do with you.' 'My Lord', she replied, 'said that he came down from heaven to save sinners such as me', and so she died.

For many years I personally have been urging people to read this book and to see the cost of this blood-bought faith which we hold. This edition puts it within the reach of all.

It is to be noted that this paper-back edition does not contain the long and scholarly footnotes with which the original edition was equipped. We recognize the impossibility of printing them in an edition like this, but, although the scholar will regret their absence, it will make little difference to the general reader. We have only one complaint—the identification of quotations is almost completely lacking, and where identifications are given, they are quite erratic. This is a very great pity; we obviously could not have the footnotes, but we certainly ought to have been told in brackets whence Workman's many quotations come. It may be that in a future printing this mistake can be rectified. And—lastly—is it too much to hope for Workman's 'Evolution of the Monastic Ideal' as another Wyvern book?

WILLIAM BARCLAY

---

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.